

Christian Faith and Life

Combining The Bible Champion and The Essentialist

Volume 37

MAY, 1931

Number 5

EDITORIAL

Is there Peril in the Worship of Jesus?

Dr. Fosdick's Thesis

SPEAKING recently in New York Dr. Fosdick aggressively opposed the Christian practice of rendering worship to Jesus. We quote: "The world has tried in two ways to get rid of Jesus: first, by crucifying Him, and second, by worshipping Him."

Speaking of this second method of getting rid of Jesus he went on to say, "The world therefore foiled in its first attempt to be rid of Jesus by crucifying Him, turned to the second, a far more subtle and fatal way of disposing of great spiritual leadership—it worshipped Him. Throughout history it has been true that when a spiritual leader has been too powerful to be crushed by opposition there has been still another way to escape his moral insights and his ethical demands, and that is to worship him. To dress up in elaborate metaphysical creeds, hide his two piercing eyes in the smoke of sacramental adoration, build beautiful sanctuaries where his challenging social ideas may fade out in vague mysticism, get him off somewhere on a high altar, pray to him, sing to him, do anything for him rather than let him get back again where he started, walking the common ways of men, and talking about how to live—that always has been the most successful way of getting rid of Jesus."

Having made this declaration against the worship of the Son of God as being in fact a violation of His own mind, Dr. Fosdick goes on to assert that a similar violation of a teacher's thought has taken place also among the Buddhists of India. He says: "In this regard, much of Christianity has gotten rid of Christ just as Buddhism has gotten rid of Buddha. . . . At first men fought against

him, but that did not succeed; he was too great to be overthrown by opposition. Now, however, conventional Buddhism has gotten rid of him by worshipping him. . . . That disposes of him! Now they can build up rituals, construct theologies, worship him in sacramental regularities, and his noble eight-fold path of moral living can be obscured in the smoke of incense. The Christians, however, are no better than the Buddhists in that regard. That is what we have done with Jesus."

THE WORSHIP OF JESUS REDUCES ETHICAL PASSION

Having thus asserted that the worship of Jesus and Buddha is a more or less conscious effort to evade the power of their moral teaching he carries forward his argument by seeking to show that the men who have been the worshippers of Jesus have been in fact ethically insensitive. Here he alleges several striking examples. He quotes:

How sweet the name of Jesus sounds
In a believer's ear!

and then asks, "Who wrote that hymn? John Newton did. Who was he? He ran a slave ship between Africa and the slave markets of his time in the days when the horrors between decks were enough to make even the reading of them turn one white. He wrote in his diary that he had never known sweeter or more frequent hours of divine communion than on some of his slave journeys, and every Sunday he read the Church liturgy twice with his crew. He worshipped Christ!"

Similarly he quotes that noble hymn of Sir John Bowring:

In the cross of Christ I glory,
Tow'ring o'er the wrecks of time,

and then asks, "Who wrote that? Sir John Bowring. Who was he? He was a British Governor General at Hongkong at a time when the British Empire was forcing the opium traffic on China, and he was the agent of the imperial policy. Everybody acknowledges, our British brethren first of all, that the forcing of opium on China is one of the most outrageous things in western history. Well, the man who was Governor General of Hongkong while that policy was enforced wrote, 'In the cross of Christ I glory.'"

Once again, he classifies Emperor Constantine the Great as a worshipper of Jesus and says, "Emperors like Constantine drenched in blood, who murdered his own wife, his son and other more remote and less significant relatives worshipped Christ."

To these he adds several notoriously godless and wicked men who in the pride of their sinful hearts used the Church to forward their personal ambitions: crooked ecclesiastics like Alexander VI, perhaps, or bloody princes like Philip of Spain and Charles IX of France, and he alleges such examples as illustrations of the moral peril of worshipping Jesus.

DR. FOSDICK REJECTS CHRIST'S DEITY

Of course Dr. Fosdick does not believe in the Deity of Jesus. He believes in what he calls the divinity of Jesus; but this is only such a divinity as he alleges also of his own mother—the divinity of a loving spirit. Here is how he puts it: "I can imagine some one saying, But then do you not believe in the divinity of Jesus? To which I answer, that I believe in the divinity of Jesus with all my faculties if we can come to an understanding about what we mean by divinity. Are you willing to start with John's idea of divinity in the New Testament: 'God is love?' That is divinity—love— . . . To say therefore that God was in Christ seems to me no theological puzzle at all. I think God was in my mother, the source of the loveliness that blessed us there! And I rise up from that with a profound sense of the reality of what I am doing when I profess my faith that God was in Christ."

"If, then, that is what you mean by Jesus' divinity,—the quality of his spiritual life—of course I believe in it and glory in it. But the historic Church too often has meant

something else, has pushed him far off to a supermundane world, throned him in a distant heaven, garbed him beyond all recognition in heavy brocaded garments of stiff theology, until the real Jesus has been gotten rid of altogether. Listen to this about Jesus of Nazareth: 'The second person of the Trinity, being very and eternal God, of one substance and equal with the Father, did take upon him man's nature,' so that 'two whole perfect and distinct natures, Godhood and manhood, were inseparably joined together in one person, without conversion, composition or confusion.' They have done that to the divine teacher of Galilee, and they have glorified in it when all the time they were getting rid of him—at last successfully crucifying him—laying him in a theological tomb and rolling a great stone at the door."

DR. FOSDICK'S SHOCKING MISSTATEMENTS SEEN

Dr. Fosdick's argument is so amazingly revolutionary from the standpoint of Christianity and so shockingly unreliable in its presentation of what it alleges to be fact, that when one considers it has been broadcast over the nation, deceiving the uninformed and causing pain to all sincere worshippers, of the Son of God, it is evident that it cannot be silently passed by.

Let us begin with Dr. Fosdick's statement about the Reverend John Newton, a sainted Christian minister and poet. He criticized him, you remember, as an African slaver, and stood this shameful practice alongside of his noblest hymn to Jesus as an illustration of how men could be worshippers of our Lord and yet at the same time guilty of the most revolting practices.

Dr. Fosdick's presentations of Newton are so extremely inaccurate as to amount to a caricature. It is impossible to understand, if he had once examined even the briefest biographical sketch of Newton, how he ever could have written anything so false.

John Newton was born in 1725. He was the son of a sea-captain. His mother died when he was a lad seven years of age. At eleven he went to the sea, under his father, where he continued for six years. He became an atheist and profane. In this state of mind and heart he served in the African slave trade. When he was twenty-five years of age he married and for a period of five years was himself the master of a ship. About this

time also he was converted but continued nevertheless for some little time in the shameful activity of the African slave trade.

In 1755, at thirty years of age, he gave up the sea partly because since his conversion he had come to feel that the slave trade was incongruous. He settled in Liverpool, became a devoted student of the Bible, and three years later applied for ordination as a minister in the Anglican Church. This was in 1758.

After six years, in 1764, he was given the curacy at Olney and ordained. He remained in this parish fifteen years, in intimate association with the great Christian poet and hymn writer Cowper. Here they produced together the *Olney Hymns*, published in 1779. Newton's celebrated hymn, "How sweet the name of Jesus sounds," is one of the *Olney* collection. The date of its writing as given in the *Episcopal Hymnal* is 1774, or nineteen years after he left the sea and the slave trade behind him. Newton's own reprobation of his earlier life is vividly expressed in his epitaph, which he wrote. It reads: "John Newton, clerk, once an infidel and libertine, a servant of slaves in Africa, was by the rich mercy of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, preserved, restored, pardoned, and appointed to preach the faith he had long labored to destroy."

To charge Newton's slaving activity against him in connection with the writing of his noble Christian hymns, which are expressions of his later converted life, is a serious injustice. Dr. Fosdick has evidently made a very careless mistake. The worship of Jesus compelled Newton to separate himself from a traffic upon which the Christian conscience of his time had not yet come to effective expression. The worship of Jesus constrained him to do this at thirty-three years of age and at the sacrifice of the only trade which until then he had known. The worship of Jesus meant so much to him that he made this sacrifice, and then nineteen years afterward, with fifteen years of Christian ministry at Olney in his memory, he was able to write:

How sweet the name of Jesus sounds
In a believer's ear!
It soothes his sorrows, heals his wounds
And drives away his fear.

John Newton's story when accurately told does not support Dr. Fosdick's criticism of

the Church's worship of Jesus but rather bears powerfully the other way.

But we go on. Dr. Fosdick's criticism of Sir John Bowring is almost equally severe and almost equally unjust. Sir John Bowring wrote six great Christian hymns that are widely used in all branches of the English speaking Church. They were written between 1823 and 1825 when he was a young man in his early thirties.

It was about this same time that he came under the influence of Jeremy Bentham and became imbued with utilitarian ideas in ethics. Twenty-four years later he was made British Consul at Canton and twenty-eight years later, Minister Plenipotentiary and Governor of Hongkong. There is thus a gap of twenty-eight years between Bowring the Christian poet and Bowring the English political leader and responsible agent in the crime of the opium transaction.

But wait! It is not true even so to say that Sir John Bowring was England's agent when opium was forced on China. There had long been an illicit traffic in opium between English ships and Chinese merchants. In 1839 the Emperor undertook to stop this traffic, and to exclude all English commerce. This was ten years before he became Governor General of Hongkong. This attitude of the Chinese Empire toward English commerce resulted in war during the early forties, at which time Chinese ports were opened to English trade, nothing was said about opium in the negotiations, though opium was certainly a principal article of import; but the important thing is that all this was settled several years before Bowring was sent out to China.

Later, in the middle fifties, when Bowring was England's representative in China, an issue arose over the violation of the rights of a ship carrying the English flag. In enforcing what he believed to be the dignity of his country, Bowring made use of military measures, which resulted in a second war with China in which France and England united. Opium probably was in the background of this second contest, but to secure the right to trade and to accomplish the recognition of European governments by the Chinese Emperor was the real and larger objective. The Emperor of China, thinking of himself as the son of the gods, had long been refusing all direct negotiations with Europeans; England and France sought to over-

come this attitude by force of arms; Russia and America chose the better approach of negotiations.

The facts then are these: Bowring's noblest hymns are all a quarter of a century earlier than his relations with China and the opium traffic. The opium traffic was an established fact when Bowring was sent out. If Fosdick had said, Sir John Bowring did not apprehend the practicability of prohibition as its solution, that he did not advise his government to institute such a policy, and that he did instead advise its Chinese regulation he would have presented a more just picture. As to the second European war with China opium was not more than a part of the background of misunderstanding which occasioned it, and in any event the responsible decisions were made not by Bowring, but by his superiors.

Dr. Fosdick suggests some excuse for Bowring because the Christian conscience was not yet formed on this question. But having admitted such an excuse he should have omitted his criticism for many facts show that Bowring was very far from ethically insensitive. He was deeply interested in Howard's prison reform and in several of the other great social movements which were developing during his life time. How far his utilitarian ethics blunted his moral ideals we cannot discuss; but in conclusion we would point out that Sir John Bowring was not a worshipper of Jesus in the Christian sense, being, like Dr. Fosdick, a Unitarian, which means, if he was intellectually consistent, that he simply revered Jesus as the noblest of men—precisely the point of view for which Dr. Fosdick is pleading.

The case is similar with respect to the Roman Emperor, Constantine. Professor Fosdick says he worshipped Jesus. There is no evidence that he did. He was not baptized until upon his death-bed, though this is not conclusive against his earlier conversion; but, while he patronized the Christian Church, recognizing its unifying value in the Empire, there is no evidence to show that he was a worshipping Christian.

Furthermore, it is not at all clear that he murdered his son. There are those who charge him with this crime and others who say that the execution of his son was because of the son's treason against the Empire. As to the murder of his wife it is not even certain that she died before him. Thus we see

that all Professor Fosdick has asserted to the discredit of those who worship Jesus falls to the ground.

Dr. Fosdick is manifestly a very careless investigator. He evidently starts out with fixed conclusions and then without much concern for accuracy tries to develop facts that will illustrate and enforce them. It is a pity that one who has his great opportunity to do good should be so unscientific in his approach to truth and so unreliable in his presentations.

OTHER ETHICAL INCONSISTENCIES

Doubtless, Dr. Fosdick could have found many instances in Christian history of men who worshipped Jesus with sincerity who were, nevertheless, ethically compromised in some of their practices. But it would be equally easy to produce a list of persons who are in sympathy with Professor Fosdick's own repudiations of the deity of Jesus and of the practice of worshipping Him, who are similarly, if not more seriously, compromised. Such men are moved with a fine passion for social reform. They are concerned about inter-racial relationships, about the profit motive in industry, about international peace, but they are shockingly careless of truth, of sincerity, of frankness, of fair play, of justice.

I could introduce Dr. Fosdick to a number of Liberal Christians (this is their chosen designation) who are in this embarrassing circumstance. Take one example. Not so far from New York a professor is teaching in one of the schools of a confessional Church, a school which is pledged to the faith of its denomination, and which requires a periodical pledge of fidelity from its faculty. This professor is nevertheless in substantial agreement with Dr. Fosdick's entire position, and persistently teaches his views in open violation of his promise to the contrary repeatedly given. Recently in his class room he spoke as follows:

"I believe that the body of Jesus was taken by enemies (from the sepulchre) to make a complete end of the Christian movement. This is my personal belief. This is heresy, gentlemen. The empty tomb did begin the Christian faith—the irony of history. The body of the Cross did not ascend. Such an ascension would be magic. The resurrection narrative cannot be harmonized. James Denney himself could not swallow the fish" (all laugh).

The Church in which this professor teaches is explicit that Christ did take again His body that was crucified at His resurrection, and that this glorified body did ascend to heaven. He has definitely and repeatedly pledged himself to teach in obedience to the constitutionally established faith of his Church. He is consciously teaching heresy, and boldly says so.

One wonders whether Dr. Fosdick would not regard such a violation of sincerity and fair play in the most sacred relationships of life quite as shocking as some of the circumstances he has noted? This professor is not a worshipper of Jesus in the Christian sense. He reverences Him as the supreme teacher and exemplar, and as divine only in Dr. Fosdick's sense.

DR. FOSDICK SERIOUSLY MISAPPREHENDS JESUS' MIND

Turning now to our Lord's own point of view, Dr. Fosdick says Jesus disapproved of men rendering worship to Him. He quotes four sayings of Jesus to establish this. They are as follows:

Jesus' rebuke of the Pharisees when he said to them, "Woe unto you, scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites! because ye build the tombs of the prophets, and garnish the sepulchres of the righteous. And say, if we had been in the days of our fathers, we would not have been partakers with them in the blood of the prophets. Wherefore ye be witnesses unto yourselves, that ye are the children of them which killed the prophets" (Matthew 23:19-31).

But Jesus did not mean to say that reverence for the prophets made men insensitive to their ethical ideals. Such a statement is a logical absurdity of which our Lord would not have been capable. Jesus meant to say that their boasted superiority to their fathers showed them to be the same kind of arrogant men. Arrogance had made the fathers blind to the message of the prophets; and arrogance was making the Pharisees, their sons, blind to Messiah's own perfect truth.

The second passage quoted is Jesus' rejection of a non-moral glorification of His mother—"Blessed is the womb which bare thee and the breasts which thou has sucked." The Saviour's reply says nothing about worshipping Him. The fact is the idea of His Deity was not yet apprehended even in the inner circle of His followers. What Jesus

was saying is that relationship to God and His eternal purpose, not the accidents of history, alone can make men blessed.

Dr. Fosdick's third quotation is Jesus' reproof of the rich young ruler for addressing Him as "Good Master." In view of Jesus' total teaching about Himself this is too evidently far fetched to need any reply.

Our author's fourth citation is Jesus' reproof of those who call Him Lord, Lord, and do not the will of His Father; but it must be evident that Jesus' objection here was not to men's calling Him Lord. He repeatedly accepted and even claimed this distinction. What Jesus objected to was not to men reverencing Him; but to an outward reverence that was not within morally aflame.

A STATEMENT OF OUR LORD'S MIND CONCERNING HIMSELF

But what was our Lord's teaching concerning the proper attitude of men toward Himself? It was far indeed from that which Dr. Fosdick would have us believe. Jesus put such an emphasis upon his own person as no other great ethical and religious teacher ever did. Of His recorded teachings fully half involve also a teaching concerning Himself. We are setting down a tabulated list of His teachings concerning Himself as recorded by the Synoptists:

Jesus calls Himself, the Son of Man, thirty-eight times.

Jesus spoke of God as My Father, twenty-seven times.

Jesus claimed peculiar and exclusive relation to God nine times.

Jesus refers to His death as a divine purposing, or as a certainty sixteen times.

Jesus fore-announces His Resurrection from the dead, and speaks of it as divinely purposed six times.

Jesus announces His Ascension and glorified return nineteen times.

Jesus promises to be supernaturally present with His followers, while physically absent from them, six times.

Jesus claims to be the supreme motive of life eight times.

Jesus claims to wield all moral and religious authority eight times.

Jesus claims that He will be the final judge of the whole world three times.

Jesus claims supreme authority over the forces of nature five times.

Jesus expresses joy and sorrow according

as men believe in or doubt Him, eight times.

Jesus accepts the title, Son of God, five times.

Jesus claims to be the Master of men twice.

One cannot read such teachings and suppose for a moment that Jesus regarded Himself as simply one among the race's ethical leaders. He commanded men, "Abide in Me," putting supreme emphasis upon relationship to Himself. He said if men indwelt Him, their lives would bring forth fruit, and if they failed to indwell Him, they would not bring forth fruit. He said if they would confess "in Me" before men He would confess "in you" before the presence of His Father. In such sayings He undeniably called men to a supreme identification with Himself.

He insisted upon being first saying, "If a man love father or mother more than Me he is unworthy of me." He stood His name beside that of the Father and the Spirit in the commission to disciple and baptize men. He left them a memorial meal as a perpetual emphasis upon His person and sacrifice.

Certainly these things do not suggest to us a personality who sought to hide himself and to give men instead a mere set of ethical principles. What teacher of ethics ever demanded that men love him more than father or mother? What pertinency would such a demand have if spoken by a mere ethical teacher? Jesus was evidently much more than a teacher. He was much more even than the greatest of men: for the greatest of men could not with propriety have made such demands.

No, Dr. Fosdick has not fairly presented the New Testament Jesus. His portrait of Jesus' mind is as distorted and unreliable as are his portraits of the Reverend John Newton and of Sir John Bowring. His idea, too, that the worship of Jesus is of a perilous esthetic emphasis dangerous to ethics is a serious untruth without historic warrant.

THE POWER OF WORSHIP

Worship, when it is worthy, is the most creative activity of the human race; and worship is at its best when it is the worship of Jesus Messiah the Eternal Son of God become incarnate. In paganism worship was in part an expression of fear. It was often a superstitious effort to conciliate a dread, non-moral supernatural.

In Israel worship was, indeed, intensely ethical. It was greatly in advance of paganism; nevertheless it did not make God seem near to men; it did not make Him a brother among us. The Shepherd Psalm expresses a most exalted sense of man's security in the tender keeping of an awful infinite divine Providence; but it lacks the vivid reality, the exalting intimacy of the New Testament's sense that God Himself, has actually come to us, has lived among us, is one of us, has triumphed over our death, and is now leading our way out into the infinite of His own glory. This is Christianity; and this is the exaltation of the Church's worship of Jesus.

WHAT IS CHRISTIAN WORSHIP?

What is worship? It is the self-prostration of man before the one perfect infinite causal Life. Fundamentally it is our recognition of all God's perfections: the recognition of the perfection of His authority, as the ruling will of the universe; the recognition of the perfection of His righteousness, justice, love, goodness, truth; the recognition of the perfection of His power as the almighty Creator and Preserver of all being. We apprehend these sublimities; we rejoice in them; we bow down before Him. We own His right to rule us, to master us. Our whole being breathes Amen to all He is and wills.

We would be one with Him. We would be bathed with the wonder of His life. We would be mastered by the majesty of His perfection. We would be lifted out of our failure and helplessness by yielding ourselves to the plenitude of His grace and power—by self-identification with Him—and as we prostrate ourselves thus, as we identify ourselves with Him thus, we are aware of the incoming of a new creative power, and we know ourselves lifted into the fellowship of His abounding life. Here is fulfillment intellectual, ethical, esthetic, infinite. This is the power and glory of Christian worship—the most creative force in the increasing centuries.

CHRISTIAN WORSHIP CREATIVE

Christian worship has enriched and transformed all life. It has changed the face of history. The martyr Church worshipped Jesus. It refused to worship every other being save Him, and in Him the Triune God. It held to its devotion in spite of extreme sacrifice. They were crucified, they were torn by wild beasts, they were chewed by dogs, they

were burned alive; and in the midst of all their tortures they sang hymns of faith and thanksgiving to Jesus. They felt themselves so utterly identified with the Son of God that they feared nothing that men could do against them. They dared all, endured all; and by their constancy and elevation they transformed paganism into Christendom.

Certainly there are still wrongs that blemish life, and those which Dr. Fosdick has listed,—war, race misunderstandings, profit as the one all overshadowing motive in industry—do cry out to the worshippers of the Son of God for righting. But because sin does even yet make us sometimes embattled and sometimes greedy is no reason why we should blind ourselves to the tremendous cycle of progress through which the worship of Jesus has lifted the human race. Womanhood is no longer enslaved to man. Childhood is no longer brutally exposed to die in the streets of the city. Excited multitudes no longer glut their eyes upon scenes of human bloodshed for sport. Slavery has been abolished from the civilized world. Tyrannies have been overthrown. Democracies and equalities have been constituted: and these things have been wrought into human history not by men and women who have thought of Jesus as an ethical philosopher, but by those, who bowing down to Him in faith and worship, have utterly identified themselves with Him as God and Saviour.

JESUS MEETS MEN'S TOTAL NEED

Certainly it is true that "there are two sets of faculties in us, the esthetic and the ethical;" but this is not the whole truth about us. We are ethical, we are esthetic, we are rational, and we are infinitely aspiring. We long for truth, for beauty, and to experience the noble joy of moral relationships. We consciously come short in all of these things. Aspiring for truth, we ever fail to find it. Aspiring for beauty, the beauty we experience is always blemished. Our ethical relationships are a tragedy of failure. We are guilty and afraid. We long to transcend these limitations which shut us in. We passionately seek to arrive at perfect immortal life. We seek but ever fail.

And then into human history came Jesus. In Him life arrived. He is the Life, the Life we long to be. In Him truth is intuitive and goodness is a song. He transcended all our limitations and even burst our tomb. If

He were no more than just this isolated fact of transcendence He would be our despair; but He is more. He is not only the Life, He is the Way. Our salvation is not by climbing the unscalable heights of His perfections. It is rather by entrusting ourselves to Him, identifying ourselves with Him, down here in the dark valley of our failure and shame.

Just as I am without one plea,

But that Thy blood was shed for me—

Just as I am poor wretched blind—

Sight, riches, healing of the mind—

Yea, all I need in Thee to find—

Just as I am . . .

. . . I come.

This is the Church's Gospel and the Church's Christ, and the creeds which have made human confessions of these majesties have not buried Jesus in a "theological tomb, rolling a great stone at the door." Rather they have preserved the central glories of the Christian faith and made them creative for the ages. Take the very confession which Dr. Fosdick criticizes:

It affirms that Jesus is of one substance with the Father to preserve for men His essential deity as God of God; God the Son, the creator of the worlds.

It says that in the Incarnation His nature as God and His nature as man remained each distinct not being mixed to produce a resultant different from both. Christ is not some new mixed order of being, neither God nor man. No, He is God and man in one person without "conversion, composition of confusion," as the creed says. He is God in man. He is God the Son identifying Himself with Man, and expressing Himself through man's nature which He has taken.

If such language is slightly difficult one must remember that the truth being expressed is vastly profound. All exact definitions are difficult whether in science, philosophy, or religion. To mock a truth because it is profound, and to appeal to intellectual laziness, seeking to get men to dismiss deep truths with a laugh because it is easier than seeking to understand them, is not worthy of a serious mind.

But enough. This is the stature of the Church's Christ, and this is the philosophy and passion of its worship of Him. The power which has streamed and still does stream into human history through this worship is the hope and the only hope of the world.—H. P. S.

Current Religious Thought

Comments on Topics of the Times

PROFESSOR LEANDER S. KEYSER, M.A., D.D.

The "After-its-Kind" Law

A contemporary tells us that an English scientist, who is at the head of an important department, makes the following statements: "In the case of plants no perceptible change has been detected during the three or four hundred years since collections of dried plants have been made. These old herbariums agree in the most minute details with their successors now growing in our fields. The Egyptians often enclosed in the wrappings of their mummies branches of plants. The botanist Scheinfurth has carefully examined a large series of these preserved plants, and no modification has been detected in the modern Egyptian vegetation." Will the devotees of evolution please take note?

More Testimony to the Same Effect

In his valuable book, *The Present Peril*, Gavin Carlyle cites a scientist who tells us about the remains of many plants and animals that once lived in Norfolk, England. Mr. Clement Reid, F.R.S., has determined the species of nearly three hundred of these plants. Two or three of them no longer live in England; "but with these exceptions," says Mr. Carlyle, "the plants all belong to the same species as now form a part of our indigenous vegetation, and most of them are to be found growing in Norfolk. During the immense interval between their former growth on the land here and the present time, they have remained unchanged, though they have had experiences of the most varied environment. These facts are fatal to the theory of the origin of species by natural selection. They clearly declare that, since they have appeared, the various species have remained to this day 'after their kind.'" *Nota bene*, all purveyors of evolution!

A No-Dogma Religion

Strangely enough, many men of vast erudition use terms in a loose and inaccurate

way. Here is Dr. Nathaniel Schmidt, the author of a new book entitled *The Coming Religion*, who, we feel sure, is an offender in this respect. He says of the coming religion: "It will have no dogmas to defend . . . but will welcome every new discovery, show hospitality to every new interpretation, maintain freedom of research, and rejoice in every advance of knowledge." To say nothing of the unnecessary use of words to express the same idea, this is not good reasoning. If the coming religion will welcome every new discovery, then, if that new discovery is a discovery of truth, it will be a "dogma" that must and should be defended, if some one attacks it. A religion that has no dogmas to defend will have no certain truths that are worth holding. What good would all the new discoveries do if they are not true and worth defending? But is not the expression, "new discovery," tautological? Is not every discovery something *new*?

Is the "Coming Religion" Something New?

Another characteristic of Dr. Schmidt's "coming religion" is that it will be ethical. "Its dominant interest will be the perfection of man's moral relations." Well, is not that one of the outstanding principles of the Christian religion? Who was it that gave to the world the Golden Rule in positive form? Who also emphasized the Diamond Rule: "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, mind, soul and strength?" Dr. Schmidt adds that this coming religion will root out racial prejudice, slavery and war, and man's inhumanity to man, and will create a universal brotherhood wherein love will flourish and peace endure. But does that sound like anything new to people who are acquainted with the teaching of the Bible? It is as old as Christianity. And, moreover, many Christian people have, all through the centuries, practiced these principles in their

lives. Read the narratives of missionaries, and see how love has been the motivating power in their lives. An ethical, altruistic and humanitarian religion is much to be desired, but it is nothing new—except to people who are not acquainted with the Bible and Christianity.

Whence Came "The Coming Religion?"

But what was the origin of Dr. Schmidt's coming religion? He gives no hint that it came from God. Indeed, deponent says nothing about religion having anything to do with God. Religion is defined as "devotion to the highest," which implies "a reverent and intense direction of thought, will and feeling." That is a nebulous kind of religion. Abstract definitions will not satisfy people who live concrete lives in a concrete world. Dr. Schmidt's coming religion does not have a divine source. It is the outcome of evolution. Somehow animals became men; somehow men began to become religious, their first form of religion being animism and fetishism; somehow, out of the selfish and gory struggle for existence, this highly humanitarian religion evolved itself. All this is impossible, illogical and absurd. Selfishness never could have evolved into its very opposite; the non-ethical never could have evolved into the ethical; the non-religious never could have evolved into the religious. Thus it appears that "the coming religion" is not based on adequate principles; it has no foundation in reality.

The Other Side—The True Religion

The true religion, which includes duties to God and man, is found in the Bible. It is a revealed religion, not a humanly discovered or devised religion. It teaches us whence religion comes and assigns for it a rational and adequate origin. Man was created in the divine image. He held communion with God from the start; hence he was religious from the start. He had a capacity for functioning religiously. That is why all nations, peoples and tribes are religious—that is, have some conception of the supernatural. Such a faculty is innate; it belongs to the very nature of man by his creation, just as truly as his soul is something that belongs innately to his very being. Without mentality man would not be man; neither would he be man without morality and religion. Here we have an ade-

quate philosophy of religion. The Bible makes no attempt to get something out of nothing. It assigns an adequate cause for every effect in the universe. Clearly as the shining sun at its meridian height does the Bible tell man whence he came, why he is here and whither he is bound.

Who Is the Master?

One cannot help wondering why the New York *Tribune* has selected John Haynes Holmes, the arch liberalist, for reviewing religious books. In a recent review of books on Jesus Christ which treat Him as Master, Dr. Holmes criticizes them in this way: "But is it so that the soul needs a master? Is there no call to the soul to seek help where it may, but in the end to testify of itself? One feels an atmosphere of surrender, of spiritual subjection, in these books, and recalls with relief Emerson's gospel of self-reliance—'Insist on yourself; never imitate.' " But did Emerson mean that man should deny his need of a divine Master? He probably meant that a man should not be a mere copyist of his fellowmen. However that may be, everybody ought to know that no man can be independent. For his very life he is dependent on the atmosphere, the revolution of the earth, the solid ground under his feet, the food and drink he takes into his body, and ultimately on God who upholds all things by the Word of His power. So man must have a master whether he will or not. The only adequate Master of our human lives is Jesus Christ, the Son of God and the Son of man.

The Fatherhood of God

Until our attention is called to the fact, and we look it up for ourselves, we are hardly aware of the amount of teaching there is in the Old Testament regarding the Fatherhood of God. Some persons today try to draw a sharp contrast between the God portrayed in the Old Testament and the God whose character is set forth in the New Testament. Let us see what is the truth in this matter. "Do ye thus requite the Lord, O foolish people and unwise? Is not He thy Father that hath bought thee?" (Deut.32:6); "Hath the rain a father?" (Job.38:28: if the rain has a father, then rational personalities must all the more have a Father); "A Father of the fatherless and judge of the widows is God in His holy habitation" (Ps.

68:5); "Like as a father pitieth his children, so the Lord pitieth them that fear Him" (Ps. 103:13: the divine fatherhood is at least implied); "The mighty God, the everlasting Father" (I Sam.9:6); "For thou art our Father, though Abraham knoweth us not, and Israel doth not acknowledge us; thou, O Jehovah, art our Father; our Redeemer from everlasting is thy name" (Isa.63:16); "But now, O Jehovah, thou art our Father; we are the clay and thou art the potter" (Isa.64:8); "For whom the Lord loveth He reproveth, even as a father the son in whom he delighteth" (Prov.3:12: when God is compared to a father, it implies fatherhood in God); "For I am a Father to Israel, and Ephraim is my first-born" (Jer.31:9); "If then I be a Father, where is mine honor?" (Mal.1:6: the context shows that God is speaking); "Have we not all one Father? hath not one God created us?" (Mal.2:10). On this blessed doctrine it is beautiful to note the accord between the Old and New Testaments.

The Thinking of This Age

Seldom have we seen more poignantly set forth certain marks of our times than the following from a brilliant writer: "It is of course much easier to have many keen thoughts than to conduct a process of thought. Many of our bright young men go about with no end of mutually contradictory thoughts tossing voluptuously in their minds. We live in an age of unorganized ideas rather than an age of clear and coherent thinking. To see life brilliantly and to see it in tiny fiery fragments is the ideal of the age. We have forgotten how to see life steadily and to see it whole." No doubt this keen analysis gives the reason why many people today see the universe in a fragmentary way, and do not see it as a coherent unity, which demands an organizing and unifying Mind back of it and in it. That is why Humanism can flash forth so suddenly and become such a momentary vogue.

Animal Instinct Not Evolved

A writer in *The Fundamentalist* (England) refers to Henri Fabre, known as "the Homer of the insect world," who was an opponent of Darwin in his day. Fabre did not believe that animal instinct was evolved, and he based his view on patent and observed facts. Instinct, he declared, must be perfect at the beginning of its operations in order to

be of any benefit to its owner. Take the case of the wasp which attacks the deadly Tarantula. It must know beforehand just how and where to stab its foe in order to reach the ganglion which controls the spider's venomous sting. Says Fabre: "The least hesitation, the slightest speculation, and she was lost. No time for a chance blow. The wasp must strike in the right spot or perish in the attempt." Cannot our scientists see that any instinct that is essential to the life of the animal must be a *given* power, and could not have been gradually evolved?

Another Illustrative Instance

In the article above cited we find a vivid story of a terrific contest between a cobra, that venomous reptile of South Africa, and a little animal about the size of a tom-cat. This little feline is known as the zorilla. The Bushmen call it the Iquaqua. When the zorilla approached the cobra, the latter hissed fiercely. Then it struck at him with lightning-like swiftness, but the zorilla dodged the stroke with greater quickness. The snake drew back quickly and struck again. This was repeated several times, until the serpent, evidently becoming slightly wearied, lay stretched out for half a second after it lunged. That was the moment for which the little animal had waited. He bounded upon the serpent like a fury, seized the cobra just beneath his hood, and with his long sharp teeth crushed its backbone. This swift process was repeated until the great reptile fell over dead, when the zorilla bit off his head and swallowed it. As our writer says, "No apprentice or tyro could have come off victorious in such an encounter." Evolution fails to explain instinct.

Science and Social Adjustment

A recent book publishes an article by Dr. Shailer Mathews. He holds that we must rely "upon science to furnish a technique for adjustments in human relations." Now we cannot help questioning such an assertion—unless every effort to right our social wrongs is placed under the designation of "science." A man might know a lot about atoms, electrons, protons, cells, chromosomes, geological strata, suns, moons and stars; but such erudition would afford very little light on adjusting our social ills. If sociology may be named among the sciences, it seems to be working out its "technique" very slowly, and

certainly has not prevented the financial and economic distress now prevailing in this country and other lands. We wonder whether the love and good will and unselfishness which the gospel of Jesus Christ inculcates and engenders, if permitted to permeate all social classes, would not quite easily find the "technique" needed for all social adjustments. Love often is more inventive than science. Love "finds the way."

"Personality-Producing Forces"

At last we come to understand what Shailer Mathews means by his favorite phrase, "the personality-producing forces of the universe." He means that there must be personality back of and in the universe or no human personalities could have come into being. We do not think that the word "producing" is well chosen. Then the expression sounds as if the power in the universe that brings forth personalities is only a *force*; and a "force" does not seem to be personal unless you plainly state that it is a force that comes from personality. Moreover, Dr. Mathews, being wedded to the philosophy of evolution, really means that man is evolved from the universe even though God is the Evolver. We think that is precisely what he means. God evolved man through the process of evolution from the amoeba by means of the struggle for existence. To our mind, a much happier and a much more scientific mode of expression would be to say that there is a personality-creating Intelligence in and above the universe, and that *He*—not a mere "force"—made man in *His* own image.

The Truth in It All

However, Dr. Mathews is right in one respect. Over against the majority of the humanists—at least, a large number of them—who want to claim for themselves a religion without God, Dr. Mathews says pertinently in the recent book called *Humanism*: "But we refuse to stop with humanity, or to leave humanity in a cosmic vacuum. We would step across the frontier which Humanism has arbitrarily declared to be ultimate. . . . As personalities must live personally with other persons, so must they live personally with those personality-producing and personally responsive elements of the universe to which we reverently and trustfully give the name 'God.'" The only trouble with such writing is that it seems to identify the

plural terms "elements" with the one personal God. To us that does not seem to be a carefully accurate method of expression. Those "elements" may be God's means or laws, but they are not the same as God Himself.

Failing to Find God

When in these notes we refer to a book and commend some things in it, let it be remembered that we do not always mean to endorse everything it contains. For example, in re-reading E. Stanley Jones' striking book, *Christ at the Round Table*, we are deeply impressed with some things he quotes from Hindu and Buddhist speakers, and his own generalizations from their speeches. Let us quote. A Hindu chief justice said: "My ultimate goal is the elevation of the soul to such a pitch that it merges into the Universal Soul." Here is the pure pantheism of the Vedantic system, meaning final re-absorption into the Impersonal All. This is from a Hindu student: "Ultimately we find that all is illusion. To get out of illusion into the Universal is religion." A Hindu pundit, learned in Sanskrit lore, puts it thus: "I believe in the way of Vedanta, but I cannot say I have realized God. I should be telling a lie if I said I had." Said a Swami: "I am ready to embrace all religions. But I must confess I am not yet a realized man. I have not found God." Here is something pathetic from a Hindu electrical engineer: "Life is a stream. I do not find a place of anchorage, and I do not know where it will lead to, or whether I will find God or not."

People Who Really Find God

At the same round tables some converted Christians also spoke, and Dr. Jones says that their testimony was clear and unmistakable. They were amazingly uniform in saying, "Christ has brought God to me." Said one: "My life was broken and He came and made it whole." Another said: "Now God has become to me intimately real." Declared another: "An indescribable sense of rest and deliverance was mine when I came into contact with Him (Christ), and trusted my sinful soul to Him." "Christ to me is life—life abundant," another stated. "God saw something in me that I did not see in myself," another said. "He won't leave me alone. In that is my salvation." In making his comparative notes from the discussions,

Dr. Jones adds: "But most impressive of all was the fact that where men come into vital contact with Christ, the God-consciousness becomes real and living. . . Men find God through Christ—not merely hope to find Him, but actually find Him." Thus everywhere the declaration of our Lord is verified: "I am the way, the truth and the life: no man cometh to the Father but by me."

Clear Testimony Impresses the Hindus

At the close of a conference a discerning Hindu said: "Today eight of us have spoken and none of us have found. Five of you Christians have spoken, and all of you have found. This is very extraordinary. You apparently find this through Christ. If He should come to me as He has come to you, I would receive Him." Said another who had opposed something that Dr. Jones had said: "This fact amounts to a mystery to me: I find Christians who have not gone through any greater discipline and moral endeavor than I have, apparently finding the realization of God. This puzzles me." On this matter Dr. Jones comments as follows: "One could not escape the impression that the non-Christian faiths seemed to be proving inadequate for life. I cannot help confessing to a deep disappointment in regard to what the non-Christians seemed to be finding as an out-turn to their faith. I had thought that the results would be greater. All these thoughtful and sympathetic Christians who listened day after day shared that disappointment."

Man Is Not an Animal

We do not like to hear man called an animal and classified in the animal kingdom. The lower part of his nature ought not to be made the standard by which he is classified. Scientists do not follow that rule in classifying other parts of the cosmos. For example, vegetables have much in common with mineral materials; indeed, the same atoms and molecules constitute the substance in both kingdoms. Yet we do not call a vegetable a growing or living mineral. So animals have much in common with vegetables; but we do not call animals moving vegetables. In all these cases it is the higher nature that is norm of classification, not the lower. The same principle should hold in fixing man's place in the cosmical scheme. The fact that, in his lower nature, he has much in common with animals does not put him in their class.

He is in a class by himself; he is a self-conscious and sentient personality, more allied to God, his Maker, than to the animals around him over which he has been commanded to exercise dominion. Yes, man constitutes a genus all his own—he is *Genus homo*.

A Sensible Conclusion

Our friend, Dr. Frank C. Nelson, author of that effective book, *After Its Kind*, made a recent statement which we feel to be of singular force. This is what he said: "Evolutionists point to the anatomical likeness of man and animal, and try to prove that it is the result of gradual changes during millions of years. They say the change is so gradual no one can notice it. If that is the case, how does any one know that the change actually took place?" So far as regards the homologies between men and animals on which the evolutionists dote so much, we think it might be well for them to note the essential differences in the anatomies of men and animals. There is hardly a bone, a joint, a tendon or a muscle that would not have to be changed greatly before the anthropoid ape's body could be turned into a human body and function like a human body. The digestive and gastronomic apparatuses would have to be changed, for the ape is a herbivorous animal, while man eats both vegetable and fleshly food. The fact is, a human mind in an animal body would be an anomaly. So would an animal's instinct in a human body.

Science Confirms the Christian View

There is nothing in the established results of scientific investigation which should undermine faith in the Biblical teaching concerning God and the universe. That teaching is that an infinite, all-wise and all-powerful personal God is the Creator, Preserver and Redeemer of the world. Think of the vast dimensions of the universe as it has been disclosed by science. Would not so vast a universe require a supreme intelligence and power to bring it into existence and to uphold it even more than if it were a small affair. We can see nothing in the great size of the universe that cancels the need of a Creator. Indeed, mere chance would be less competent to bring a vast cosmos into existence than a small one. Then consider the infinitesimal. When we remember that the atom is a complicated mechanism and not a simple one,

we surely can see that there is all the more need of marvellous intelligence to bring even the atom into existence and to impart to it the functioning power it displays. No; the Biblical view of theism is the only adequate explanation of the diversified phenomena of this vast and wonderful universe.

Children Running On All Fours

It is remarkable that Professor Ales Hrdlicka has come out with a five-dollar book treating of children who run on all fours. He has assembled a number of such cases. His inference is that we humans are derived from pre-human ancestors. Such an inference is not necessary. Before little children are developed enough to walk on their legs, they naturally must creep about. Then some of them before they can walk upright can hardly go in any other way than on all fours. In the creeping period we have seen many children slide about on the floor, while they helped themselves along with their hands and arms. What kind of an origin would that connote? A sled glides along over the ground, but we can think of no animal that does—unless it would be a snake. But that gives no hint of genealogy. The little child simply has to crawl before he can walk. By crawling he gradually gains strength to walk upright, as he was intended by His Creator to walk.

The Winona School of Theology

Winona Lake School of Theology is the result of a conviction that there should be functioning in the great Middle West, during the summer season while the regular seminaries are closed, a high-standard, interdenominational, evangelical School of Theology, where ministers, teachers, students, Sunday school workers and laymen, who are engaged during the regular school year, may study under the direction of the strongest faculty available from among the outstanding Professors of the evangelical Theological Schools of the land.

The school has a Bible-centered curriculum, has no isms to foster, is standing firmly in defense of the faith "once delivered," and against a destructive criticism of the Bible.

One full half quarter (6 weeks) of work, is divided into two terms, July 8 to Aug. 14, 1931.

Work may be pursued in one or both semesters. Work is offered toward the B.D.

degree, the M.A. (in Theology) and the Th.B. degrees.

Mr. C. E. Sawtelle, a prominent and devoted business man, is president of the Board of Management. By his influence and gifts he has proven himself a real friend of the school. Dr. William E. Biederwolf is the founder of the school, and still has much to do with shaping its policies. Professor J. A. Huffman, D.D., is the dean, and also gives instruction in Greek exegesis.

The other members of the faculty for the coming summer are the following: Leander S. Keyser, D.D., of Hamma Divinity School, Wittenberg College, Springfield, Ohio; Julius R. Mantey, D.D., of the Northern Baptist Seminary, Chicago; George L. Robinson, D.D., of the Presbyterian Theological Seminary, Chicago, and Melvin G. Kyle, D.D., of the Pittsburgh-Xenia Theological Seminary, Pittsburgh, Pa. Dr. Keyser will give a course in Christian Psychology and Ethics; Dr. Mantey will conduct a course in the Book of Revelation; Dr. Robinson will give a course in the Old Testament; Dr. Kyle will deal with "The Problem of the Pentateuch" and "Historical Geography." These men will also deliver lectures in their respective turns at what is known as the "Daily Popular Hour."

Persons who desire further information regarding the school should address the Dean, Prof. J. A. Huffman, D.D., 302 Morton Blvd., Marion, Indiana.

The Old-Fashioned Preacher

How dear to my heart is the church of my childhood,
Where I took my first step in the straight, narrow way;
The little white church "near the thick-tangled wildwood,"
Where mother and I went on each Sabbath day.
There was no large pipe organ, no high-paid soprano,
The singing was scarcely the best ever heard,
But the man in the pulpit, divinely commissioned,
Poured out his whole soul in proclaiming the Word.
An old-fashioned preacher, a real Bible-preacher,
A Spirit-filled preacher who honored the Word.

How thrilling it was just to see him in action,
A soldier of Christ with a keen trusty "sword,"
Who wielded his weapon with zeal and devotion,
And backed up his thrusts with a "Thus saith the Lord!"
No uncertain sound ever came from his trumpet,
His hearers were moved—yea, convicted and stirred,
And bowing the knee in wet-eyed confession,
Accepted the truth as revealed in that Word.
Through this old-fashioned preacher, this full-gospel preacher,
This Spirit-taught preacher who honored the Word.

Sometimes as I list to the ramifications
Of science, that twist my poor brain out of shape,
Or hear the consensus of scholarship's findings
Regarding our old friend the anthropoid ape;
As my mind reels, confused with drives, plans and programs,
And world-federations toward which we are spurred,
Sociology, politics, internationalism—
I sigh for the sermons my infancy heard
From that old-fashioned preacher, that soul-stirring preacher,
That heart-warming preacher who honored God's Word.
—P. H. Kadey.

The Messiah of Natural Goodness

C. H. BUCHANAN, D.D.

WHAT a world of evil seed may be sown in a single discourse!

A forceful speaker in the prime of his manhood stood before the senior class of divinity students at Cambridge, Massachusetts, and addressed them on their life-work, as follows:

It is a luxury to draw the breath of life. The grass grows, the buds burst, the meadows are spotted with fire and gold in the tint of flowers. The air is full of bird-song and sweet with the balm of new hay. Night with its welcome shade brings no gloom to the heart. Through the tranquil darkness the stars pour down their almost spiritual rays. Man under them seems young and the world a toy. . . One is constrained to respect the perfection of the world in which one's senses hold converse. How wide, how rich and what invitations from every prospect are given the faculties of man. . . But the time is coming when all men will see that the gift of God to man is not *seclusive sanctity*, but *natural goodness*.

Thus, on the soared, drawing pictures of the "overpowering beauty which appeals to the soul," until he reached the climax of his soul's burden, which was as follows:

Christ belonged to the race of true prophets. He saw with an open eye the mystery of the soul. Drawn by its severe harmony, ravished by its beauty, He lived and had His being there. He alone in history established the true greatness of man. One man alone was true to what was in Him, is in you and me. He saw that God incarnates Himself in man, and is ever going forth to possess the world. *In the jubilees of emotion*, he said: "I am divine. Through me God acts; through me He speaks. Would you see God? see me, *see thee when thou thinkest as I now think* (*Italics ours*).

Calmly consider that statement made in the presence of a class of "open-minded" divinity students, all ready to swallow the flowery statements and ask no questions,—as this writer was in his youth. But, what was back of all those flowers? In his very next breath the speaker reveals his manner of mind, which has caused endless trouble:

But, what a distortion did Christ's memory and doctrine suffer in the next and following age! "This was Jehovah, come down from heaven. I will kill you if you say He was a man." The idiom of Christ's language, the flower of His rhetoric have usurped the place of truth . . . Christianity became as myths, as the poetic teachings of the Greeks . . . He spoke of miracles, for He felt that man's life was a miracle, and all that he doeth. . . But a miracle, as pronounced by the Christian church, is Monster. It is not one with the blooming clover and the falling rain.

What a telltale exponent of the mind of the man! As a "distortion" it is beyond compare.

Nor are we so limited in our knowledge source as not to recognize what the speaker had in mind when he spoke of "seeing God in Christ." Evidently he was but paraphrasing our Lord's reply to Philip when that disciple asked: "Show us the Father and it sufficeth us." The Lord's answer was: "Have I been so long time with you, and hast thou not known me, Philip? He that hath seen me hath seen the Father also." Here was no Jubilee of emotion," but the sane words of sober truth, setting forth the nature of Christ himself.

Besides this, in many other passages He sets forth in positive statements, His divine nature: "I and my Father are one . . . I in the Father and the Father in me." Every one of the Gospels tells the same story. To them all He was their divine Master sent of God . . . "Son of the living God," and their testimony is not a "poetic expression of sublime emotion," but matter-of-fact statements of truth, as was also Christ's reply to Peter who had just said: "Thou art the Christ, Son of the living God," when he said: "Blessed art thou, Simon bar-Jona; flesh and blood hath not revealed it unto thee, but my Father which is in heaven." How shall we label the perverseness of mind that would refuse to accept such plain statements of truth? Is it stupidity or pure prejudice? If such statements are "myths," then there is no history. If the testimony of eyewitnesses, such as Matthew, Peter and John, be myth, then all is myth. Yet on the ground of such positive witness stands the doctrine of the incarnation, which so many of today deny.

DENYING THE MIRACULOUS

Since our speaker subsequently became the representative of a group who denies the miraculous in religion, we must know what he meant by saying: "Man's life is a miracle." Later on he tells us his meaning:

Does not claiming that Christ was the same in nature as ourselves annihilate the argument in favor of Christianity drawn from miracles? . . . Assuming that Christianity rests upon the authority of miracles, *it has not been shown that the power for working miracles is not the result of human perfection*. We count nothing miraculous that is done by common men. But, were all in a state of ignorance, and one should come among us, the wonders he would work from his knowledge of astronomy, or of science, would seem to us to be ascribed only to miraculous power. If to this be added the character of religion,

we would do homage to him as divine. Now, Christ had all the knowledge that man can possess, consequently, his work must always seem to man, so long as they remain imperfect, as divine, though they were the result of his knowledge, and in no violation of God's Law (*Italics ours*).

Now, here is stated, in the most insidious manner possible, the erroneous opinions underlying much of the philosophy of the day,—the crux of the strife between Christianity and material science, implying as it does that belief in miracles is the expression of ignorance,—out of which sentiment has come the term "obscurantist," as applied to religious people. Besides, it fosters the opinion that all miracles will disappear with the advance of scientific knowledge, as contended for by modern scientists of the *test tube* type.

Just here two fallacies emerge which should be countered by the truth:

1. A miracle is not a superstition,—a belief without foundation. It is not the outgrowth of ignorance, and will not disappear as men become "more perfect" in knowledge. Nor is Mr. Huxley's definition of a miracle—"an extremely wonderful event"—correct. A miracle may be extremely wonderful, but this only describes but does not define a miracle. *A miracle is an event implying divine power.* If it could be accomplished by human agency, it is not a miracle.

2. This leads up to much church confusion and weakness, of today. If, as our illustrious speaker seemed to think, all of religion can be accomplished by human agency alone, then there is no need to call upon the Heavenly Father for help. Poor foolish mortals! to try to make it appear that, as Christ who was but a man like other men, could accomplish so much by human agency alone, we too may do the same! This being the philosophy of religion, prayer degenerates into mummary, becomes useless, and man will grope in darkness and defeat, because he depends upon his own human impotency. The divine decree is, "Not by might nor by power, but by My spirit, saith the Lord." By substituting human sufficiency for divine help, why should a church not become a pitiful something?

Our speaker saw that he was heading towards the conversion of souls, so he said: "The aim to convert a soul by miracle is a profanation of the soul." Our Saviour said: "Except a man be born from above, he can not see the kingdom of heaven." Was this "profanation" of the soul? It is God's plan of salvation, and in no wise does it exalt man to self-transforming dignity, but leaves him to depend upon God

for salvation. As St. Paul expressed it: "By grace are you saved, and that not of yourselves, it is the gift of God." Now, if this be "profanation of the soul," Heaven grant us world-wide profanation! Even skeptical Hume could see that "our Christian religion not only was attested by miracles at the first, but at this time it cannot be believed in without one. Whoever is *moved by faith* is conscious of a continual miracle in his own person, giving him a determination that is most contrary to custom and experience." That is, a new heart and the spiritual mind.

The *new birth* has been a mystery all down the ages, and is none the less puzzling to the material scientists today than it was to Nicodemus when the Lord said to him: "The wind bloweth where it listeth and thou hearest the sound thereof, but canst not tell whence it cometh or whither it goeth; so is every one that is born of the spirit."

If, as our speaker said, "Christ had all the knowledge that man can have" and if "fullness of knowledge will explain all miracles," why did not the Lord explain the new birth to Nicodemus? The answer is: Conversion is God's work and not to be accomplished by human agency,—not by education, nor by science, or culture, or even by eugenics.

It has long been the conviction of this writer that much, if not all, the defeats and gropings of modern Christianity, with all her culture, have been due to an attempt to build up and advance the kingdom of heaven by means of unregenerated souls, and to push her forward solely by human wisdom and strength, forgetting the first essentials of success. Our speaker thought that, "a true conversion is now, and always will be *by the reception of beautiful sentiment*" (*Italics ours*). Christ taught that it was by being born from above. Which method shall we accept, Christ's or the "modern" one? Our speaker seemed to object to an "exclusive sanctity," but in our day not this but *inclusive* wickedness, *natural meanness*, is the problem we have to face, with all its disregard for God and religion.

The speaker's philosophy of making converts by the "reception of sweet sentiments" seems not to have worked in his own day, or he would not have bemoaned the deadness of the religion of the times, as he did. In the many years since then, his philosophy has been more thoroughly tried out in the speaker's own beloved New England than in any other place on earth. Yet, with all its culture, "sweet sentiments" and "natural goodness," sin has always

been deeply entrenched, and is today, as in other sections. Here his theory of "natural goodness" seems to have failed. Surely, there must be something wrong with the philosophy, or the results would have been far different. There was a discord, as was demonstrated in the personal history of the speaker.

SOME PERSONAL HISTORY

Every speaker who stands before the public must consent to the making bare his own record, and even his soul, to the gaping throng. In this respect our speaker was no exception.

After graduating from Harvard at the age of eighteen, he taught for several years. And at twenty-six he was called to the pastorate of a church in Boston. Before a great while he let his church know that in administering the Lord's Supper, he could not conscientiously use the ritual in the Prayerbook, which said: "This is my blood of the new covenant, *shed for you and for many, for the remission of sins.*" To use this would have been to acknowledge the divinity of Christ and His vicarious sacrifice for mankind. If Christ was only a man, like the rest of us, how could His blood be shed for the sins of the world?

The congregation demanded the continued use of the orthodox ritual; the pastor persisted in his religious scruples, so he resigned from his first church; and the only sermon he ever printed set forth his reasons for resigning his pastorate. The memory of this episode was evidently back of his statement: "I confess that the attempt to project and establish a Cult with new rites and forms seems to me vain. . . . All attempts to contrive a new system are as cold as the new worship introduced by the French to the Goddess of Reason." Along with this went the fact that his old congregation had demanded the continuation of the orthodox ritual. Why not? Is it to be supposed that a creation of a thousand years standing, which has become as the very voice of the soul, is to be cast aside simply because some erratic youth comes along with some new thing?

Before concluding his address the speaker lamented the moral and religious deadness of his times,—this, too, near the close of the life in his community, of one of the most eloquent and influential preachers that America ever produced. Nor can we discover in the many years that have elapsed since then, any distinguished victories gained in the conversion of souls to Christ by men of that faith, or any great advancement made in the conquest of the world for Christianity.

While the evangelic churches have in this period accomplished wonders in soul-saving, the cult of our speaker has with difficulty kept its head above the wave. With its reputation for being highly cultured and for education, in soul-saving its influence is practically negligible. This must not be construed into a "railing accusation," but the simple statement of history. How but by its fruits shall we judge a tree?

Evangelism—"preaching the Gospel to every creature"—when faithfully and lovingly done, has never failed, either in cultured America or in darkest Africa. It is God's method of saving souls by repentance and faith, and not by the reception of "sweet sentiments," nor by development of "natural goodness." The Gospel of a crucified Redeemer is the power of God unto salvation, to every one that believeth."

A PLEA FOR MINISTER'S MANHOOD

In his peroration our speaker became very earnest and eloquent in pleading for individuality in the religion of the preachers,—a need always prominent. Men in every age have been too willing to drift with the multitude like thoughtless dumb sheep, with never a thought of the whither. Our speaker's words were: "Friends enough you will find who will hold up to your emulation, Wesleys and Oberlins . . . Thank God for such good men, but say, *I am also a man.* Imitation can go no higher than its model" (*Italics ours*).

Yet, we know that every man has his "hero," his ideal, who has been to him an inspiration. Would that every young preacher had a model like those mentioned above! By holding up Christ as the Saviour of the world, these men saved their thousands and put the whole Christian church on a higher plane. Not for an instant did they tell men that man could be saved by developing "natural goodness." They called men to repentance and to faith in the redeeming Lord.

All of the natural goodness possible to humanity has not saved it from degradation. It did not save them in Christ's time; nor did it save them in New England, in the lifetime of our speaker. It is not saving them today. Had salvation by "natural goodness" been possible Pilate would be unknown to history, there would have been no crucifixion, no Pentecost and Christian Church. None would have been needed.

"The power of God unto salvation through a crucified Christ" has led mankind up to where the best stand today, looking out to a coming

triumphant era. While this hope is rejected by some and neglected by others, their attitude allows sin to become rampant. It paralyzed many a church, who, while "the fields are white unto the harvest," stand with empty hands when they should come laden with many souls, "as brands snatched from the burning."

As a religion, this self-generated "natural goodness," may suit the men of "liberal thought," but will it meet the needs of a world of sin and suffering? Will it regenerate men and awaken their soul-instincts? Will it inspire the Church with the enthusiasm of faith which overcomes the world? Will it help needy men to find God and the road to heaven? Will it awake the heroism needed in the mission field today, the world over? If not, it is a delusion and a snare.

It has not done so in the quiet days of the past; will it be more potent in the stormy days of the present and the dark future? Realizing the fact of the failure in the past, by open and direct attack, men of this modernistic cult are resorting to deliberate "peaceful-penetration," by invading institutions of learning, there to infuse their virus into the open minds of un-

suspecting students. The next step is to send out these enthusiastic young men as "up-to-date ministers," not to break with their mother churches who feed them, but to remain quietly within the fold and do their destructive work. The declaration has been made that "a good many are doing more where they are than they possibly could do elsewhere. They are doubtlessly capturing strongholds which could not be taken by direct attack." Thus, the hidden work goes on, militating against orthodox Christianity today. Oh, the shame!

Many years have passed since our illustrious speaker's day, who lived to be an old and famous lecturer and writer. What mighty work might he have accomplished as a consecrated minister? A contemporary of like length of life came to lay at the foot of the Cross 20,000 souls saved as sheaves garnered for God. What a wonderful trophy!

A recent Reviewer spoke of our speaker as: "The Messiah of Modernism." Well, for those who refuse the Messiah of God, Emerson might do,—or perchance, Brigham Young.

See, *Transcendentalism*, by Emerson, pp. 85-193.
Richmond, Kentucky.

Preaching in Evangelism

BISHOP ARTHUR J. MOORE, D.D., LL.D.

IT is the urgent need of a new emphasis upon evangelistic preaching that has caused me to consent to speak at this time. The whole Church of Christ, and the Methodist portion of it in particular, needs to ask itself how this paramount duty and privilege is being discharged, in the face of the moral and intellectual difficulties of these crowded days in which we live.

It is hardly necessary for me to enter into any defense of preaching as a method of making Christ known to men. This is assumed. Man's dependence on preaching is clearly stated by Saint Paul in his letter to the Romans. It is so important I quote the whole of it:

Whosoever shall call upon the name of the Lord shall be saved. How then shall they call on Him in whom they have not believed? And how shall they believe on Him of whom they have not heard? And how shall they hear without a preacher? And how shall they preach except they be sent?

The value of this passage is its revelation of the importance of preaching, and the light

it throws on the immediate obligation of those whom God has called to proclaim His message. No change in human thought or earthly conditions has changed the essential facts of human nature. The obligation to preach abides and the need is as urgent as ever before. No situation has arisen, or can arise in human life, individual, social or national, which is outside the Divine interest, or not within the compass of the truth as revealed in Christ.

This discussion brings us naturally to the question, "What is to be the subject of our preaching?" We are agreed that it is not a theology. To be sure, theology is important and has its place but we have not been called to preach a theology. It is not a moral code that we are to expound. Laws and principles of conduct are as necessary as well ordered thought is for the mind. Careful instruction as to duty and the conduct of life can never be absent from Christian preaching. Philosophy, science, literature and art are all excellent and serve their purpose. But that which

comes home to the human heart and satisfies all the varied needs of men is the message of a living Person. We are to preach Christ, not as a Teacher, not as a Pattern, not as an Ideal but as a Saviour. It is this which gives us a complete and sufficient message for the spiritual requirements of all men.

Evangelism suggests to us not only the content of our message but the spirit in which the message is to be delivered. The central conception of the word is that of a message from some one to some one. The evangelist is the herald of good news. He comes bearing the proclamation of God in which grace, pardon and deliverance is offered. The evangelist may at times denounce sin, or discuss judgment in the sense of punishment, but his message cannot end there. He has more to tell. He is sent to sinning men, men under the sentence of death, to tell them of God's provision for their forgiveness, cleansing and deliverance. He comes with joy and gladness. He brings the news of a loving Heavenly Father and a Divine Redeemer. He knows nothing of hopeless cases from the standpoint of his gospel. His message is as broad as the love of God and as deep as men's deepest spiritual need. His message is nowhere more perfectly summarized than in those familiar and sublime words, "God so loved the world that He gave His only begotten son that whosoever believeth on Him should not perish but have everlasting life."

With these thoughts in our mind, let us analyze conditions as they are today and inquire what kind of evangelism is applicable to our present day needs. It is always easy to generalize about the failure of Churches and preachers. It is not so easy to bring in a bill of particulars with evidence sufficient to sustain it. We are all agreed, however, that the Christianity of our day is in sore need of a recovery of a vital passion for the redemption of the lost. Many Churches are both prosperous and complacent. We are in grave danger of a ministry so accustomed to comforts and warm firesides that soon it will dodge the dark nights, steep hills, yawning chasms which lie between the sheepfold and the lost sheep, out in the desert, sick and helpless and ready to die.

That we stand in Christ's stead to plead with men to be reconciled to God is not always the first article in the creed of the modern preacher. Some would commit this min-

istry of rescue entirely to vocational evangelists, rescue workers and missionaries on the foreign field. Others seem determined to make of us agents of social service. We ought to be, and are, genuinely interested in all the social implications of Christ's teaching but the fact remains that men have sinned and need to be saved. The world's greatest need is not better housing conditions, pure air and fresh sunshine, but a Divine Saviour who can so completely transform the individual that he will no longer be the same man living the same old life but a new man living a new life in a new world. Old things must pass away and all things become new. A spiritual transaction so radical and thorough must take place that those who receive it become new creatures in Christ Jesus. This is our message and the true evangelist will never blunt the sharp edge of truth or be satisfied with half measures.

If Methodism is Christianity in earnest then it logically follows that Methodist preachers must be men in whose hearts the message of Christ burns like fire. They must be men who are gripped by a divine urge which gives no rest day or night. The great soul winners of all ages have been such men. Of one it was written, "He always preached like a man who had just escaped a sacked and burning city; his ears still stung by the cries of the dying and roar of the flames, his heart full of gratitude at the thought of his own escape." I am convinced that a perpetual sense of surprise at one's own salvation and call to preach lies at the very basis of an effective ministry.

Too few of our sermons are directed at the main business of preaching. Randolph Bourne said: "Most sermons today are little more than pious exhortations to good conduct." Sylvester Horne, a modern day prophet, said: "We have some faith left in education, but almost none in what our fathers called conversion."

Here is a warning we cannot dismiss. It is so easy to rely on oratorical displays, on enticing words of men's wisdom, on correct theology, on scholarly accuracy, literary finish or charm of style. All these gifts are valuable but none of them can probe the sore of sin or offer a divine remedy for the sins of men. Such preaching allows men to forget their responsibility to God and the awful and eternal consequences of sin.

Long range evangelism will never save the world. Conviction of sin never takes place except by the Divine spirit under the preaching of the gospel of Christ. Hence the importance of the "evangelistic note." A decay of the sense of sin usually follows when that note is absent from the pulpit. We are not called to be social reformers or ecclesiastical engineers. A burdened and perplexed world, standing face to face with the grim realities of life, conscious of its rebellion against the law of God, groping hopelessly each day nearer to the experience of death, is asking for the message of a Divine Redeemer.

That soldier lad standing in a muddy trench in Flanders Field, just about to go over the top to face screaming shrapnel, was voicing humanity's need when he said, "It's all right to entertain me but I want someone to tell me how to die." Men still want the old message of salvation by faith in a personal Saviour, made vital by a minister who manifests in his life something of the earnestness of Jesus.

When will we learn that magnificent ritual, high class musical selections, or learned discourses on secular subjects will not long attract the multitudes, or redeem them should they come? The world has a right to expect that our preaching will breathe with something of the spirit of the compassionate, unwearied, yearning Christ. When solicitude for the lost goes out of a minister's life he ceases to be a true minister.

We are hearing entirely too much of the "blessings of moderation" and the "dangers of fanaticism." St. Paul could hardly control his feelings as he approached his message. He spoke with a joy that only the apprehension of a great truth brings. We need to study these truths afresh for our own hearts until we tell the story with an inexpressible rapture of heart. We must recover the glow, the radiance of early Christianity. We must live at white heat. Preaching must become a romance of daring enthusiasm. If when we come to our pulpits we can only remember that we are facing men and women who are spiritually lonely and need divine companionship, those who are in sorrow and need comfort, those who are wavering in the long fight against sin and need new courage, then we will refuse to be drawn aside to less important matters. Then we will tell the story of Jesus with a genuine passion.

This is the secret of the heroic and sublime sacrifice of Jesus. It was his unwearied compassion for men which enabled him to refuse the tarnished glory of a wrecked ideal and to choose the radiant splendor of a fulfilled purpose, even though the path to it was the path of his cross. David Brainerd felt this spirit when he cried, "O that I were a flaming fire in the hands of God." A Chinese Christian expressed it when he said, "We need men with hot hearts to tell us the love of Christ." If we deliberately choose to maintain a tepid, lukewarm attitude toward the lost about us, we might as well say good bye to any degree of spiritual greatness as well as any large share in the redemptive work of Christ.

I conclude with this interesting story. There is in Salvation Army headquarters in London a tablet put up in the humble rooms where General William Booth used to meet poor wretched sinners and love and pray them into the Kingdom of God.

Long years after General Booth had gone to his reward, an old man came one day and stood long before that tablet and then went in deep emotion to the one in charge and asked: "Can a man say his prayers here?" On being told that he could he fell on his knees beneath that tablet erected in memory of the great soul winner and cried aloud: "O God, do it again, do it again." I would that the ministry of today had such a passion for the winning of men to Christ that fifty years hence men would be pleading "O God, do it again."

San Francisco, California

THE OVERFLOWING CUP

"My cup runneth over." He had not only a fulness of abundance, but of reabundance. Those who have this happiness must carry their cup upright, and see that it overflows into their poor brethren's emptier vessels. The showers which fall upon the highest mountains should glide into the lowest valleys.

The fact that you are a Christian may, without doubt, assure you a safe entrance into heaven, but it may not mean that you are much of a blessing to your friends about you. God makes the life to overflow that other men's lives may be touched with your power. For it is only the overflow of your life that proves a blessing to your friends and kindred. It is the overflow of the Nile that makes the valley of the Nile fruitful—*J. Wilbur Chapman, D.D.*

An Able Divine on Christ

JOHN ALFRED FAULKNER, D.D.

A FRIEND has requested a judgment on some points made by a liberal minister in an orthodox church on our Lord. It occurred to me that what I have to say might interest others as much as this friend, as it concerns matters of importance. But as I want nothing personal to enter but only the truth, have avoided names and mention the divine simply as author.

1. The Roman Catholic Church and all other churches when they say, Mother of God (*theotokos*), mean this and this alone, that the person born of her was divine as well as human, was God as well as man. It is not meant that she was mother of God in a strict sense, which as author says, would be blasphemous, nor that she was the mother of the Godhead of Jesus, but that the person born of her was God as well as man, that is, the eternal Word and Son became man through Mary. The expression is so open to misunderstanding that it ought to be avoided, and I never use it. But for all that it sets forth an eternal truth.

I suppose the phrase was suggested by Acts 20:28 (blood referred to God, two oldest and best manuscripts) and Lk. 1:43 (where child in womb referred to as Lord=theos to Jews), and other passages where Christ or Word is called theos (God).

Author is wrong in inferring that Rome originated or is specially interested in the phrase Mother of God. This had nothing to do with the start of Mary worship, though in the later stages of that worship it might have incidentally helped, though there is no reason why it should. In its origin it had nothing whatever to do with the honor of Mary, but solely with the honor of our Lord. Nor did Rome suggest it. It was first used by Alexander, bishop of Alexandria, in his controversy with Arius (about 320), equivalent expressions were used long before by Ignatius (about 115) and Irenaeus (about 180), and later the same word by Origen, Athanasius and Cyril of Jerusalem.

Like all the great words in the christological development it sprung from the Greek mind. It is not only absurd to say, as author does, that what he calls Kenoticism (the belief that the Son "emptied" himself and came

to earth) leads to Rome, because Paul and all the early Christians except a few Ebionites were Kenotics, all the Greek Fathers were, the Greek Church was and is, and has remained till this day opposed to Rome, and all Protestants except Unitarians have been Kenotics but it should lead directly in the opposite direction. For having Christ as divine Saviour and Lord they need no pope nor church as infallible guide and saviour.

I think it is unwise to use the word Mother of God, as I said, not because there is not behind it a precious truth, but because to the uninstructed it is bound to lead to false ideas. You will find full discussion in the different theological Encyclopaedias (see esp. Blunt, *Dictionary of Doctrinal and Historical Theology*, s.v. *Theotokos* and in Liddon, *Divinity of Christ*, later eds., 258-263).

2. Part of what author says on creeds is commonplace, and almost every one believes it. Intellectual integrity and honesty of research,—no creed can take the place of them. But no one Protestant or Catholic "assents to some statement about Christ merely because it is authoritatively prescribed for him." The man who said, "We don't try to think, we let others do our thinking for us; we simply believe," was either speaking on the spur of the moment, without due consideration as to the meaning of his words, or he was a freak. But when it is said that what "makes the unity of Christendom, what makes the unity of the body of Christ, is not the intellectual assent to a formula, but the free surrender to a common purpose of service and love," it is evident that the author has not thought the matter through.

A common purpose of service and love is not peculiar to Christendom or the body of Christ at all, and never has been. Pagans, Jews, Buddhists, etc., have had that common purpose. The unity of the body of Christ can consist only in something that is characteristic of that body as such, say (a) belief in God the Father, (b) belief in Christ as Saviour and Lord, and (c) all the loving service you wish as the fruit of that faith.

3. I don't think author intends to "make Jesus subjectively imperfect," or if so only in the sense that he denies the "divine fun-

dament that constituted his essential being." As I understand, he thinks that Christ was essentially human only (whereas Christ was essentially human *and* divine) and that he had a real inclination to the things to which he was tempted, and his greatness consisted in willing not to yield. Author's error is not in thinking that Christ's temptations were real, but in thinking that because they were real he could not be divine. He forgets that Christ was not two beings but one being, essentially human though eternally Son of God, that therefore his temptations were as real as any saint's are, but with the same improbability of yielding, buttressed also by his God consciousness and constant communion with the Father.

4. Yes, author makes sorrow an eternal part in God's own experience. His point is that what God feels or does once he feels or does always. There is truth in this. The cross is an eternal expression of God's thought, etc. On the other hand, author forgets that when God made the universe and men he placed himself in time relations, and that in all things concerning the universe and man he must think and act in time relations. To that extent he limits himself. "How God is at one time he is always." Yes, in essence or possibility but not in action. Of course "God is fundamentally sacrificial," but that could not in the nature of things be shown till sin

began. So that in those temporal relations in which only sin was possible there *was* a "specific moment when divine sacrifice began" and when it ended.

5. Does the New Testament magnify as author does power of the moral influence atonement? Moral influence in reference to Christ's work is a modern conception,—it hardly entered the minds of the ancients. It was started by the brilliant scholar Abelard in the twelfth century, lay dormant, taken up by the Italian lawyer Socinus in the sixteenth, kept by his Unitarian successors, and adopted by so called modernists in the twentieth. The New Testament knows nothing of it in *relation to Christ's redemption in itself*. What it does know is influence of Christ on the saints in following and loving him *after* their becoming saints.

But does not Christ say, If I be lifted up I shall draw all men unto myself? Yes. What does he mean? This: You Jews are going to crucify me. You think that will finish me. But it will only be the beginning of my influence on history. I shall become a world figure, the Saviour of the world. As to Christ's drawing all men individually to him for salvation, he not only confines that to believers (John 3:14,15), but he confines the believers to those whom the Father draws unto Him (6:44).

Madison, New Jersey

The Fighter of Fairmount

CLARENCE TRUE WILSON, D.D., LL.D.

THE Delmarva Peninsula, a part of the Atlantic seaboard jutting down into the ocean and bordered by the Delaware Bay on the East and the Chesapeake on the West, includes all of Delaware and the eastern shores of Maryland and Virginia. That alluvial off-spring of ocean and bay receives its poetic name from the abbreviations of the three states of which it is composed.

On a neck of land projecting from this far-famed peninsula into the Tangier Sound and bounded between the Annemessex River on the east and the Manokin on the west, is a little scattered community once known as "Potato Neck" but later named more euphoniouly Fairmount,—probably because it was not fair and there was no mount.

When we moved there in '80, we had lived in Boston and in Wilmington. We packed our goods and took the down state train through Delaware into the Eastern Shore of Maryland. We knew that Fairmount was seven miles off any railroad and there were no telephones. The roads were hard and dusty in summer and bottomless in winter. The cold weather was breaking and we wondered how we would reach our destination. We looked out of the window and heard the conductor call out "Eden" and one of the family burst into tears as she saw that forlorn station, and cried, "If this is Eden what must Fairmount be?"

We had passed Salisbury and were now nearing the aristocratic little county-seat town of Princess Anne, Md., and soon after

we heard the longed for name of "Westover." This was the railroad station nearest Fairmount. We beheld a top wagon drawn by a pair of mules—Jack and Mouse. Mr. "Sammy" Hall had been sent by a hospitable people to convey the new "Methodist preacher and his folks" to Fairmount and the well stored, well lighted parsonage, where dinner had been provided and the larder stored for many days.

The boys of the family, of whom this writer was the oldest, found an ample yard of one and a half acres. Great oak trees gave shade in summer and bedding for horse and cow in winter.

No man ever knew how many leaves a tree produces unless as a boy it was his duty to rake them up and store them away for winter use. One can work all Saturday afternoon, clearing up the yard and by Tuesday there will be more than before.

Did nature ever concentrate so many of her charms in one locality? The Peninsula has no mountains, or wild scenery, but it has ocean shores, two world-famed bays, and rivers that wind and interwind, and the homes of the prosperous people face these beautiful little streams. The front yard with its green sward slopes down to the bank everywhere covered with trees that produce luscious peaches, apples with variegated color, and even figs in abundance; and at the water's edge were fish of every desired variety, and crabs, hard and soft-shelled, and oysters from the briny deep seem to come up and call.

Rabbits were plentiful and we made traps and caught many, each giving us a great thrill as of a conquerer. In the mild season of the year boating, fishing and crabbing on Hall's creek held the boys enthralled. We took a hunk of fat meat, tied a strong string around it tightly, with one hand hung it over board and with the other had a long pole with a crab net at its end. A half dozen crabs jumped for the meat and the net would come up neatly under them and we would get at least three. If we caught too many, and we generally did, we had prepared a floating box. We dumped our crabs into this to await their shedding their shells,—and behold, soft shelled crabs, the delicacy of the season, the delight of the connoisseur of the Chesapeake riches.

At that time the malaria was rife in Fairmount. The tide would overflow the swamps,

settle in pools, breed mosquitoes and they would swarm so thick that I have seen them darken the roadway so it would trouble one to see the horse he was driving and blind one to every team or rig that was coming down the road. It was not uncommon to hear "Mr. Bill Tom Ford's best cow was killed last night on the marsh, eaten up by mosquitoes." "A horse of Mr. Bill Ed. Ford got mired in the marsh and before anyone could find him in the morning, he was killed—bled to death by mosquitoes." Chills and fever! We lived on them. Everybody kept a big jar of quinine on the shelf. Calomel and quinine were staple supplies. Intermittent fever, malarial fever, typhoid fever raged in the community incessantly. The Methodist Church had sixty funerals one summer, and nothing was done about the condition.

The people took their religion and their politics seriously. The opposition would fight at the drop of a hat or a chip from the shoulder. There were three stores, each of them centers of their respective clans. One in Upper Fairmount was run by Miles, Avery & Company. It had the Post Office. The Republicans were in power. Otherwise the other store run by H. Clay Blank would have had it. In lower Fairmount Joseph H. Muir had the only store, so he had the Post Office whether Garfield or Hancock was President; whether Blaine or Cleveland won; it was all the same there.

The subjects that ruled the politics were Local Option and White Supremacy. The communities divided on whether a negro had any rights that a white man was bound to respect. And Fairmount had long settled that in the negative. It was a favorite trick to find a colored man in trouble, bail him out, pay the lawyer or court costs and have him sign away his services till the debt was refunded. In this way the white man had a slave for years without having to buy him.

A negro woman, named Eliza, lost her husband. She was left alone with a little seven-year-old daughter. During her husband's illness of some months duration, the H. Clay Blank store supplied her groceries. It looked like a fine charity! But the inevitable pay day came. H. Clay Blank and "Doc" Doe drove down to the little cabin home and demanded payment immediately. There was no money. Eliza took in washing, but her white neighbors had not paid promptly: so she had to give up her daughter, binding her

over to H. Clay Blank till the debt was paid. She was told the law required it. She signed by making her mark before the witness brought for the purpose. No provision was made for seeing her little girl—not once a week, or once a month, or even once a year. The screaming child was put into the buggy between the two men and driven away. Weeks passed and this widow, bereft of husband and now of child, went to the store, but no sight of her daughter was vouchsafed. The mother told sympathizing friends she didn't know whether "Sophie" was dead or alive.

One Sunday afternoon the child slipped out of the house to run away to her mother. Instinct must have drawn the mother to start for the store keeper's house to recapture her daughter. They met at the back gate, and hand in hand, made their way the two miles over fields and woods to the humble home.

The child was missed. The inseparable pair, Doc Doe and H. Clay Blank, loaded a shot gun for this mother and drove post haste to the cabin. They called for her to come out and bring "Sophie." She appeared in the doorway with a hoe to protect her home and child. The heroic leader of the brave pair drew the shot gun and fired it point blank at this mother. She fell in her own doorway and the other companion ran around the back way and caught the screaming child, snatching her from her stricken mother and desolated home. Though one of the men was a doctor, Eliza was left in her blood and would soon have bled to death but for colored neighbors who secured the service of the other doctor of the town.

The Magistrate fined the two one dollar and twenty cents each for this deed. That was his usual fine for bootleggers whom the community brought before him—that is, if the case was perfectly clear and there was no way of clearing them outright.

The church sometimes had good meetings. It depended on whether the preacher was muscular enough to make the sons of Belial wish to let him proceed. But misbehavior in church was characteristic of the meetings, and "bush" meetings generally provoked disorder, such as pulling the pegs out of one side of the boards on which the seats rested so that, when the preacher was midway his appeal, a sharp shove and fifty people would land on the ground. Breaking a leg or an ankle that happened to be doubled under only

added to the interest and to the coarse fun of the lawless element who could see little excitement unless some one got hurt; and if they did not hurt some one, they must at least scare all hands.

In the preparation for the meetings seats were arranged by setting boards up edgewise and pinning them in place with stakes. Seats are then placed across till a thousand people can be seated before the platform for preacher and choir. The meetings are to be held at night, but there are neither electric lights nor gas, so a square box is built, elevated on four legs ten feet high, and filled with dirt. Wood is piled up on this and arranged with paper and kindling so that a match is all that is required to light up the place. Four to six of these firestands surround the auditorium. The light shows the face of preacher to the people and the eager faces of the people are revealed to the speaker. But if the meeting gets to going so as really to threaten an invasion of the ranks of the unregenerate, their leaders will slip around and conceal hand fulls of powder in the earth under each fire of the light stands. When, later in the evening, the fire finally warms through the earth that covers the powder of these light stands, they blow up and blazing timbers fly in every direction. Such were some of the coarse jokes played on the good people by the rowdies of fifty years ago.

Perhaps the gentle reader does not know that there were colored Aunties who could work "spells" on anyone who offended them, as recently as 1880; but such is the fact: and so neither negro nor white person of Somerset County would walk before Aunt Jane. "She might cast her spell upon us." If she did it was either death or bad luck.

So, too, there were "haunted houses." I have heard strange noises in some of them myself. I know a sailor preacher who once determined to correct such superstitions; but he had to admit that there are "fated ships!"

When the world, the flesh or the devil were not doing anything to you, there were ticks. A walk through the woods or a stroll in the fields, or a rest on a log all cost the same price. A tick had to be removed the same night or the next day. If you "pulled" him off your flesh, you left his head inside to fester. You must take a silk string, twist it around his neck, put a stick in the end of the knot, and take one more twist each day till the tightening cord around the tick's neck

discourages him from the bloodsucking mode of making his living, and he relinquishes his hold upon his human victim and one more bloody battle ends in peace,—or at least in a temporary armistice.

Strange to say, Fairmount was a dry community. Somerset County had local option by districts, Dublin District being the one exception. Some of the leaders had made the community think that if they stayed wet they would get the trade of all the other districts of the county, and they *did* furnish most of the murders, rapes, and three-quarters of the litigation that took place in the courts of Somerset County over a period of fifteen years.

They did not, however, monopolize the trade, for the bootlegger was then abroad in the land; he stayed on the edge of Fairmount and did business on Saturdays in Princess Anne. He met the incoming boats at Deal's Island and Dam's Quarter. These places seemed to have profane names for "Deal's" is a modification of "Devil's Island." Dam's Quarter also had a profane history and cognomen.

Most of the people down here voted the straight "dimmokratik" ticket, and to scratch a name was a sacrilege—although it seemed to be no sacrilege to have the devil or some of his imps upon it, and elected. Vote-buying was common. This writer has seen the Democrats get out a full state and county ticket in the old days with the picture of Abe Lincoln upon it. This would be handed out to the colored people who, seeing that picture, would hasten to vote with a smile of satisfaction on their somber faces, showing the white in their eyes and their whiter teeth. It was commonly said that they would put a *rat* on the ticket next time, and make them think they were ratifying the Constitution, and saving the nation.

It was easy to get men for five dollars apiece to vote certain ways, then sign the name of the buyer upon the ticket. I have seen these men stand all night as ballots were being counted, while negroes stayed outside the window until their particular ticket showed up, and then the would-be judge, district attorney or sheriff, as the case might be, would hand out his five dollars to the smiling voter, who would walk away with the feeling that he had at least made something by his patriotism.

The type of politics may be indicated by the Justice of the Peace who came down to Fairmount once a week. His name was James Furnace. He had been appointed by the Governor and had held the office since "the memory of man runneth not to the contrary." If a white man did anything to a negro, he was generally told "be careful and not disturb the peace any more;" if a negro did anything to a white man, it was the jail or the penitentiary. If white or black was convicted after long months of immunity of selling liquor without a license, they invariably got a fine of \$1.20. This seemed to be the Justice's share of the proceeds and he wasn't extravagant in his other demands. His sympathies were quite as broad and intense for the bootlegger as many judges higher-up whom we have developed in the twentieth century.

What this county and community needed was a master who was not afraid to go up against rum-rule, dirty politics, race prejudice, ruffianism, superstition, and general baseness, and give it an alternative, either the Gospel of Love or of Muscular Christianity, whichever the occasion seemed to require.

The names in this series of historical articles are not authentic with the exception of the hero.

Washington, D. C.

(To be continued)

Heap O' Livin'

(Contributed by FRANCES THOMAS)

Home ain't a place that gold can buy or get up in a minute;
Afore ut's home there's got to be a heap o' livin' in it;
Within the walls there's got to be some babies born, and
then
Right there ye's got to bring 'em up 't women good, and
men;
And graverly, as time goes on, ye find ye wouldn't part
With anything they ever used—they've grown into your
heart;
The old high chairs, the playthings, too, the little shoes
they wore
Ye hoard; an' if ye could, ye'd keep the thumb marks on
the door.

Ye've got to weep to make it home, ye've got to sit and
sigh,
And watch beside a loved one's bed, and know that Death
is nigh;
An' in the stillness of the night t' see Death's angel come,
An' close the eyes o' her that smiled, and leave her sweet
voice dumb.
For these are scenes that grip the heart, an' when yer
tears are dried,
Ye find the home is dearer than it was, and sanctified;
An' tuggin' at ye always are the pleasant memories
O' her that was and is no more—ye can't escape from
these.

Ye've got to sing an' smile fer years, ye've got to romp
and play,
An' learn to love the things ye have, by using 'em each
day;
The roses by the garden walk must blossom year by year
Afore they become a part o' ye, suggestin' some one dear,
Who used to love 'em long ago, and trained 'em jes' t' run
The way they do, so's they'd get the early mornin' sun;
Ye've got to love each brick and stone from cellar up to
dome.

It takes a heap o' livin' in a house to make it a home.
—Edgar Guest.

The Inscription of Scripture

2 Tim.3:15-17

C. NORMAN BARTLETT, S.T.D.

I WANT to present a personal statement of the grounds of my faith in the Bible under three heads.

First, *the universal appeal of the Bible to the human heart proves that its author must be He who reads the souls of men.*

Upon the very threshold of any real thinking about the Bible we are mightily impressed by a tremendous fact. Most books die young. Many expire at birth. A very few live to a ripe old age. One in a million, perhaps, becomes immortal.

The Bible stands supreme among all literary productions. Through the centuries it has gotten a grip upon the hearts and lives of millions of people that is absolutely unparalleled in the history of human thought.

Never has the Bible been so popular as it is today. And it has lived and grown in favor despite the trickiest attempts to undermine confidence in its integrity, and the most desperate attempts to wipe it out of existence. Facts like these demand adequate explanation.

What makes books alive? What are the elements of abiding greatness in the world's classics? Many answers might be given to these questions. But we will all have to admit, I think, that chief among the requisites for literary immortality there must be depth and breadth of human appeal. Many books burst like skyrockets into resplendent popularity,—and as quickly pass into gloomy oblivion. They touch ephemeral interests and stir surface emotions. They do not strike deep enough to take root in the heart of humanity.

The works of the great masters, on the other hand, bore down to the elemental depths of human nature and there leave the seeds of undying truth. Books that live come from writers with a consummate understanding of the soul of man.

But the appeal of the Bible is infinitely deeper and more far-reaching than that of any other book ever written. Men of every time and place have been thrilled and gripped by its message.

We of today have not outgrown the Bible. It is found in the palace of the prince and the hovel of the peasant. It is the inspiration of the mighty and the solace of the low-

ly. It has been carried by devoted missionaries to benighted lands far across the seas. It has been taken to the hearts of people of every race,—white, black, brown, red, and yellow. Rich and poor, learned and untutored, great and obscure,—people of every class and condition have found in this Book a light of guidance, a tower of strength and a fountain of inspiration.

It has an undying appeal because it meets undying needs. It unlocks the secret chambers of the soul. It probes the lowest depths. In all the world and throughout all time there has been no book to compare with the Bible in knowledge of man. Who but He who unerringly reads the hearts of men could have been the Author of the Bible?

Second, *the Matchless Power of the Bible to minister to the Highest Development of the Soul proves its Author must be the Creator of the Soul.*

The Bible has blessed mankind beyond the power of language to express wherever it has been accepted and its teachings applied. The history of human progress runs parallel with the spread of the Scriptures. The Bible guided the Hebrew nation into an ever-deepening understanding of God and righteousness. It planted the Christian Church. It overthrew the mighty ramparts of paganism. It fortified martyrs amid the most terrible persecutions. It evangelized the barbarians. It launched the Protestant Reformation. It established liberty in England. It kindled the Wesleyan revival. It was built into the very foundations of our own greatness as a nation.

And who can be blind to its power in the world of modern times? Wherever this wonderful book has been carried, it has dispelled the densest ignorance, banished the grossest superstition, overthrown the mightiest bulwarks of iniquity, emancipated womanhood, abolished slavery, founded hospitals and all kinds of charitable and humanitarian institutions, launched the great forward movements of every description that have advanced human welfare and proved the mainstay all through the years of those things that make for happiness, security, prosperity, peace, and righteousness of individuals and peoples.

And where this same wonderful Book has been spurned and its teachings thrown overboard, the outcome has been regression and moral collapse. The message of the Scriptures is wonderfully adaptable to all the changing conditions of society. Who can deny that the people who leave upon their fellowmen the strongest impression of true character are those who must faithfully follow the teachings and trust the promises of the Bible?

It has long proved itself supreme among all books ever written in its power to bring out the very best in the life of the individual and of society. Who, then, but the soul's Creator can have been the Author of a book so transcendently mighty in helping man to become what he ought to be?

Few things will so strengthen the thinking powers as a study of Philosophy. The mind grows sinewy through wrestling with the speculations of giant thinkers. But no one who has not learned to think for himself should attempt to make his way through the labyrinthine depths of philosophical thought. He will almost certainly lose his way. The further we go into Philosophy, the more clearly do we see how impossible it is for human reason alone to arrive at ultimate truth.

Into what pitiable absurdities have godless philosophers fallen? Plato, who has been called the greatest speculative genius the world has ever known and who lived in the fourth century before Christ, said, "We will wait for one, be he a God or an inspired man, to instruct us in our duties and to take away the darkness from our eyes," and at another time he said that man would never know God until God should reveal Himself in the guise of suffering man.

And in the Bible we have just such a revelation as Plato longed for. It instructs us in the duties of life. It tells us what God's will is for us. It illumines the depths of our souls. It throws light upon the mystery of immortality. Above all it reveals the infinite love of God in His Son who came to suffer and die for the sins of the world.

Third, *the Peerless Supremacy of the Bible as a Book with the Power to Lead Men into an Experimental knowledge of God, Proves that its Author must be the God it Reveals.*

But what of those who have believed the Bible and sought to conform their lives to its teachings? Have they found God thereby and

learned to love Him? From the dim mists of the receding centuries, from the swirling activities of modern life, from the palaces of kings and the cottages of the lowly, from the halls of learning and the shops of labor, from isolated farm and busy metropolis, from lands far across the sea, from the ice of Labrador and the scorching sands of Africa, from America and Europe and Asia, the answer comes with a mighty and swelling and deafening shout, "We have found God in the Bible!"

The experience of countless thousands confirms the trustworthiness of the revelation of God found in the Bible. Science worships facts. Scientific truth is reached through intensive research and unremitting gathering of facts. Before an overwhelming weight of evidence preconceived ideas go down to destruction like trees in the path of an avalanche.

Are not those speculative thinkers, then, utterly unscientific who set at naught the experiences of millions upon millions of men down through the centuries who have found the Bible in fact a revelation of God? Is not the fact that men possess God through the Bible as through no other literature a proof that God is in the Bible as He is in no other book? This is the scientific test.

The greatness of any book can best be judged by experts in the field in which it stands. We call an artist and not a machinist to pass judgment on a picture just as we would call a machinist and not an artist to pass judgment on a new piece of machinery. The story is told of a mathematician who would throw *Paradise Lost* into the rubbish barrel because it did not prove anything.

I submit that the greatness of the Bible is to be judged not by what those think of it who have never opened its pages or who have read it with eyes blinded by hostile prejudice. No! The testimony to the worth of the Bible, if the testimony is to carry weight, must come from those who are expert in prayer and faith and worship and in living according to the will of God.

Is there not something profoundly significant in the fact that the people who live in closest fellowship with God through faith and prayer and obedience must highly prize the Bible as His Word? Those who love God most deeply believe the Bible most strongly. We trust the superior insight of a loving mind as compared with a hostile prejudiced one in other matters, why not here?

The Philadelphia Fundamentals Convention

WHY should there be such a convention held? Deceitful and destructive errors, arrayed in attractive epigram or phrase, are often welcomed guests even in Christian circles. This is because their real character is not recognized. A most popular one now is—"Truth is mighty and shall prevail." As most always quoted the implication is—truth will conquer error by its own power, without brave soldiers contending for its supremacy. This is a most subtle and subversive falsehood. This phrase, because of its insidious and undermining craftiness, is worthy of the coinage of "the father of lies." For all history is proof that, truth triumphed over error only when courageous and unconquerable soldiers fought for it.

Knowing this, and seeing the vital doctrines of Christianity assaulted in print, pulpit, lecture room, fourteen years ago, and now on-the-air, in Philadelphia, a noble band of ministers and laymen, from all over our country and the world, founded "The World's Christian Fundamentals Association." Its purpose is "to contend earnestly for the faith once for all delivered unto the saints." The method of its operation is "constructive not combative." Since the birth of this Association its annual conventions have been held in several of our largest cities. This year its convention will be held in Philadelphia, the city of its birth, in Bethany Presbyterian Church (The Wanamaker Church), May 17-24. All are invited, yea, urged to attend these convention meetings. More complete notices will appear later.

The committee on arrangements and programme presents the following:

"The theme this year will be 'The Personal Return of Christ.' *Various emphases* have been made from year to year, as, for instance, last year when the theme was 'The Holy Spirit.' It has been twelve years since the Lord's Return has been stressed, and therefore it seemed well to emphasize 'the blessed hope' this year. We have tried to be sensitive to the Holy Spirit in choosing our theme, and then of necessity we had to be sensitive to the needs of the Church and the world at this present time. These are days of stress and uncertainty, and men are hungering for the certainties of the Word of God. The outstanding need of the hour is a Heaven-sent revival and the speedy evangelization of the world. We know of no better way to bring this about than to emphasize the Lord's return and related themes. We owe this great truth to the world and to the Church if we are to fulfill our stewardship of the Scripture. No subject could be

more timely and pertinent. People are thinking of it as never before, and our convention theme will arouse nation-wide and worldwide interest. *The presentation of the theme must be loving and constructive, not combative.* The practical effect of this truth upon life and service must be emphasized. Our convention must above all else be spiritual, and therefore we shall major in the deepening of the spiritual life, evangelism, and missions."

"While the program is not completed the following speakers are already engaged:

Dr. Harry I. Ironside, Moody Memorial Church, Chicago.

Dr. Arno C. Gaebelein, author and Bible teacher, New York City.

Dr. W. B. Riley, First Baptist Church, Minneapolis.

Dr. Will H. Houghton, Calvary Baptist Church, New York City.

Dr. W. H. Rogers, Hinson Memorial Church, Portland, Ore.

Dr. Stewart P. MacLennan, First Presbyterian Church, Hollywood, Cal.

Dr. M. R. De Haan, Calvary Undenominational Church, Grand Rapids, Mich.

Paul W. Rood, Turlock, Cal.

Arthur H. Carter, Editor of *Bible Witness*, London, Eng.

David L. Cooper, President of Biblical Research Society, Los Angeles, Cal.

Miss Elizabeth L. Knauss, author and lecturer, Davenport, Ia."

"Among subjects to be discussed will be the following:

Prophecy or the Proof of Inspiration.

The Biblical Logic of the Second Advent.

The Two Aspects of our Lord's Return.

Looking Backward Over a Third of a Century of Prophetic Fulfillment.

The Menace of Bolshevism.

The Shadows of the Great Tribulation.

The Present Sanhedrin Movement and Its Great Possibilities.

Why Evangelize Israel in This Generation?

The Day of the Lord and Its Unspeakable Glories.

The Eternal Issues.

These are just a few of the subjects, but they indicate in part what is in store. Each subject will be dealt with by one who has made a special study of this theme. One of the unique and interesting features last year was the Surprise Hour; this will be repeated in Philadelphia, as it gives us the opportunity of hearing outstanding speakers who come to the convention and who otherwise would not be heard. A prayer-meeting for World-Wide Revival will be held every morning at nine o'clock.

The many world-renowned speakers will attract. The great crisis that the world is passing through is causing men and women to think more seriously than they have done for decades. Are we on the threshold of a great revival, or is the Lord's return at hand? Many believe that one of these events must take place very soon. Will the Philadelphia Conference give the answer?

Christian Evidences

BISHOP H. M. DuBOSE, D.D., LL.D.

The Rationalé of Regeneration

THE doctrines of redemption, as they are stated in the written Word, do not fall into a theological *ordo salutis*; that is, they do not appear in the sequence of experiential happening. This comes of necessity, since the gospel is a life, and not a body of institutes, nor yet a categorical philosophy. But, for all this, every doctrine adduced from the record of the evangel is both logical, as to its relations to human reasoning, and complementary of each and every other teaching necessary to salvation.

Of the doctrines of redemption, regeneration is to be reckoned as chiefest in point of importance. As a term, it is practically synonymous with that of soteriology. When its significance and relationships fully have been identified, it will appear both as a theodicy and as a comprehensive symbol of Christian evidence. Indeed, the Master himself forecast this use of the word when he said: "Ye which have followed me, in the regeneration . . . shall sit upon twelve thrones, judging the twelve tribes of Israel." A study of the spiritual operation involved in regeneration will show its manifold bearings upon human life, as also its vital relations to the life of Godhood.

The rationalé of regeneration runs to the springs of those intellectual and emotional movements which transcend the terms of both theology and philosophy. It is a mistake to hold that scholastic philosophy is the last and surest method of identifying truth, or of assembling the finalities of its proof. Always, history is the ultimate voice for determining what is in humanity, both as to its self-consciousness, and as to its knowledge of the universe in which its fortunes have been set. Philosophy no more than can collect and put in order those elements of life which are seen as raw materials of history. On the side of its divine direction, history is the record of regeneration as it has operated, first upon the individual, and then upon the race at large.

The literature of revelation is the oldest, as it is the determinative type of history. Desultory objection may be offered to this claim; but another form of final history, archaeology, has spoken, and from its verdict there is no appeal. It is in this literature of revelation, the body of history preeminent, that the doctrine of the Godhood, the record of Jesus Christ, and the conditions of salvation, or regeneration, are set forth. These Scripture truths are susceptible of various forms of restatement, which fact is the character of general and systematic theology. When at itself, theology is the application to the doctrines of grace of the principle of logical proof. These observations will help to introduce our present study, *The Rationalé of Regeneration*.

In the effort to develop our theme, we shall have respect to four lines of inquiry—namely; first, concerning the purpose in moral creation to realize the image of God in men; second, concerning the universal blight of sin, by reason of an earthly and corrupted humanity; third, concerning the Incarnation, or the divine approach to the problem of redemption; fourth, concerning the work of the Spirit in the new birth. A fifth consideration well might be added, which would relate human response to the work of the Spirit; but this response is assumed as a condition necessary to the Spirit's address to the individual life. "As many as received him to them gave he power to become the sons of God."

First, then, concerning the purpose in moral creation to realize the image of God in men, the issue takes the form of an all comprehensive plan. Regeneration, as a prophetic necessity, is implied in the divine revery: "Let us make man in our image, after our likeness." As a corollary of material creation, the life of man, produced at the end of the sixth day, was subject to inherent weakness; and, as afterward appeared, to dominating influences of sense and appetency.

The realization of the perfect divine image was, therefore, to come at the end of a process of spiritual attrition and human response. This process, beginning in the crisis of the new birth, but continuing through indefinite time, is the regeneration discoursed of in the evangel, the life given from above, without which no man can see God. Thus, while sin, the transgression of the law, was not unavoidable to man at his beginning stage, the regeneration of the Spirit was always a necessity to his moral being.

Given the primeval state of man without sin, it was only through the operation of the Spirit that his life could have grown into the divine life, thinking the thought and working the work of God. A spiritual birth, the recognized crisis in regeneration, plus the natural, or creation, birth would have been as indispensable to unsinning man as it was to the sinners of Eden. St. Paul clarifies this situation when he says: "For we know that the whole creation groaneth and travaileth in pain until now . . . waiting for the adoption, to wit, the redemption of our body."

"The first man Adam was of the earth earthy;" and, regardless of what conditions might have obtained, even supposing a sinless Eden, his maintenance in righteous thinking and living could have resulted only from overt spiritual operations, such as are attributed to regeneration in the words of gospel revelation. The scheme of redemption, as to its very detail, was preconceived for, and adapted to, the ends which have been, and are being, wrought out in human history.

The history of conscious regeneration began with the discovery by man of the commandment, and the instant and sad discovery of his lack of moral strength to meet its behests. It was then that grace began to abound. To the constitutional weakness of man's flesh was added the tragic handicap of sin. This constituted a lapse both from original innocence, the primal image of God, and from the moral vantage upon which he was first brought face to face with the law. This was the fall, the extent and consequences of which cannot be minimized by any process of reasoning or scientific rescension of the record. No fact in the universe is so glaring as sin; and no explanation of its presence in human life can take the place of the account given us in the Eden story. Given sin as a fact, without the Eden story, gospel regeneration, which necessitates forgiveness of sin,

would rest on no rational foundation; certainly, on no dependable datum.

From this point of view, the rationale of regeneration brings to one consistency the double work of the Spirit, in destroying sin and creating, in penitent believers, a new nature, which is to substitute the nature grounded in the flesh, the being which came of the dust. This substituted nature is the image of God, a deduction which is in perfect line with St. Paul's doctrine of the new man, which supersedes the old man with his deeds. It also agrees with the history of Christian consciousness, both in the life of the individual believer, and in the output of the larger Christian testimony. The struggle against sin is toward the image and likeness of him for whose glory man was made, a purpose of the divine will before sin had foiled the innocency and thwarted the possibilities of the beginning.

We must always begin our thinking on the doctrine and experience of regeneration with the words of Our Lord, addressed to Nicodemus: "Ye must be born again." The form, indeed, is: "Ye must be born from above." The necessity of regeneration is genetic and absolute. The original stage of creation life was but introductory; it described the organic and functional complement of life, its brain possibilities, its heart emotions and their sensuous adjuncts. Upon these impinged the life from above, which was to enter through the climax of a birth of power, which was gloriously realized in the Bethlehem Nativity.

Sin did not surprise the divine plan; it was eternally foreseen and provided against. Regeneration was the goal of life from the beginning; and Christ came, not only to make atonement for sin, but to deliver life from the entailments of its natural birth; in other words, to complete the creation of God.

The universal blight of sin is depicted by St. Paul in the first chapter of the Epistle to the Romans. There it is shown that sin comes through human choice. "Even as they did not like to retain God in their knowledge." Sin not only wrought original disobedience in man's will; but it perverted that will, so that the hurt went to all men, for that all have sinned.

Therefore, it follows that, both because of the letter and the spirit of sin, and the elemental moral lack of man's nature, the need for regeneration is universal. Had the

first man kept the commandment inviolate, it would not have followed of necessity that his offspring, without exception, had imitated his choice; which simply would have been to put the fall upon newer ground, or at a new stage of human conduct. But the atonement and a new creation, provided for in the gospel from the beginning, met the complex needs of the human state. In the Incarnation, and in the work of building the divine nature into man's nature, Godhood fulfills itself, in realizing its image and likeness, according to the primal forecast.

This brings us to a contemplation of the Incarnation as the method of realizing, through regeneration, the perfect image of God in humanity. The angel which announced to Joseph the coming birth of Christ said: "And she shall bring forth a Son, and thou shalt call his name Jesus; for he shall save his people from their sins." Clearly, this is to be construed as meaning not only the forgiveness of sins through atonement; but also the removal of the cause of sin through the birth from above, of which the Master himself later taught. The Bethlehem Incarnation, in large, eternal outline, projects upon humanity that regeneration power which was pertinent and accessible to the first man, Adam, before his sinful fall, as also afterwards. There were no accidents or afterthoughts in the plan of redemption; no after-maths of readjustment.

Short of the Incarnation of Godhood in Jesus Christ, the new divine nature could

not have come to pass in man. In this office, the Incarnation did more than serve as an example, or illustration. It brought to the consciousness of men a power of mastery and a royal kinship of blood and passion, which more than restored the status of un-sinners to men. In truth, it brought the divine image to men, and opened the way for the Holy Ghost to seal that image upon each believer's life.

Regeneration and Incarnation are correlative doctrines within their degrees. What happened in the Christ life of Incarnation happens to the believer in regeneration, to the extent to which humanity is related to the incomparable glory of the Galilean Manhood. Regeneration stands in the Incarnation; and the Incarnation is expounded only in the Virgin Birth. This brings us to the work of the Holy Spirit in regeneration.

In my new volume, *The Bible and the Ages*, I have taken the position that the regeneration office of the Spirit began with the primal creation; also that the appellation *Jehovah*, throughout the so-named *Jahvistic* sections of the Old Testament, is particularly used in connection with the movements of the Third Person of the Trinity. The regeneration wrought through *Jehovah* the Spirit is the norm of the eternal purpose; and regeneration is the channel, eternally provided, for the extension of the Incarnation to the multitudes of those called to be saints.

Nashville, Tennessee

Current Scientific Discoveries

PROFESSOR GEORGE MCCREADY PRICE, A.M.

The New Discoveries in Physics

BOOK after book is being issued these days in an effort to explain to Mr. Everyman some of the radical changes in the attitude of modern science toward religion which have resulted from the recent discoveries in physics.

Thirty years ago, the leaders of physics held the attitude that about all the important discoveries in their field had been made; future work in physics would be chiefly con-

cerned in verifying the recognized results of physical measurements to one or two additional decimal places. But modern students of this science no longer adopt this attitude. They no longer weep that there are no more scientific worlds to conquer; if they feel like weeping, it is at the vastness of the unknown before them.

For one thing, the luminiferous ether is gone forever. This hypothesis was adopted

to furnish a material with which to "explain" the transmission of light. But the Michaelson interferometer has shown that there is "no ether-drag as our earth hurtles through space at nineteen miles or more per second"; all the phenomena seem to take place as if no such stuff as an ether exists at all. With this disregard of the ether went also the old wave theory of light,—except, of course, as a mere mathematical statement of observed effects. Gone also are all hopes of being able to explain such phenomena as gravitation and all the similar forms of action across vacant space, or "action at a distance," as Newton called these phenomena. An eminent modern scientist declares, "We do not know, nor can we ever expect to know, the mechanism of gravitation."

The old materialistic view of the structure of matter as being composed of little hard balls, the atoms and molecules, or their supposed components, the electrons and protons, all ceaselessly engaged in knocking one another about, is forever gone, except as a conveniently vivid figure of speech. All we can really affirm about these ultimate components of the stuff or our universe is that they are points of centers for the radiation or the reception of energy. Indeed, the newer views are placing the emphasis on *energy* instead of on *matter*; energy they say is the more important of the two, and indeed all the phenomena of nature may be best understood as merely manifestations of energy. An extreme form of stating the new views would be to say that matter is composed of units of electricity. But nobody has a glimmer of an idea of what electricity really is.

But the newer views of physics are getting results. The new world of subatomic phenomena, first made known by the discovery of the X-rays and radioactivity, is gradually being reduced to order and exact mathematical statement. In the minds of some people, any action of nature is "explained" when it can be stated in mathematical symbols. On this basis we now have most of these marvellous phenomena of the subatomic world "explained" for us. But all the real thinkers among our modern men of science realize that our equations may tell us the *methods* of these phenomena, but they can never tell us *why* they are what they are.

Some of the movements around us are manifestly due to *pushes*; we can see and otherwise objectify a stuff or a material

"cause" for the movements. But a large number of the phenomena around us seem to be like *pulls* across absolutely vacant space; and for these we cannot imagine any material cause whatever. We may express very exactly just how these phenomena take place in terms of mathematics; but an algebraic equation can give no answer to that intellectual hunger of the human soul which longs to trace every effect back to some objective "cause." The Christian may with bowed head realize that in these "uncaused" or inexplicable manifestations of nature we are being brought face to face with the direct control or fiat-action of the great Jehovah, the living God, who has not in any sense delegated His power or His authority to the protons and the electrons. Certainly it would seem that any one who refuses to accept this view of the case must say that these phenomena are forever without any explanation.

One of the important features of these new discoveries is the fact that pure mathematics seems to be the key in which all the intricate phenomena of nature take place. But mathematics is a manifestation of thought, and we cannot have thought without a Mind. Hence the new views in physics are leading all workers to recognize a Supreme Mind back of all the material phenomena. When matter was supposed to consist of little hard balls all in ceaseless motion, devout people spoke of the Prime Mover of the Universe. This was the view of Aristotle. Our modern scientists tend to speak rather of the Prime Mathematician, which to me seems to be a decided step in advance. This is the method by which Professor James Jeans states the present situation in his "Mysterious Universe."

The old physics of the nineteenth century was strongly inclined toward objective materialism. The new views in physics seem tending strongly toward the subjectivism of Berkeley. Both Jeans and Eddington appear to have adopted Berkeley's view, though they expressly state that science never can have anything to tell us about the reality behind phenomena,—it can tell us only how the various parts of the universe behave or conduct themselves. And Jeans at least is emphatic in saying that we must never adopt views about ultimate reality which would in effect deny the real objective existence of the world around us.

In a brief paper like the present one cannot enter into any detailed study of what we really mean by the New Physics. The many astonishing discoveries grouped under this head have brought about such a change in the entire attitude of physical science toward such subjects as philosophy and religion that the new era is already being hailed as The New Renaissance. Matter, which the common-sense view had always supposed to be composed of inert, solid lumps, which were being ceaselessly knocked about by various "forces," is now considered to be essentially only a form of "energy," with at least many of the old chemical elements disintegrating before our very eyes. Obviously matter is not eternal; it must have had a beginning; it must have been created, as Jeans expresses it, "at some time or times not infinitely remote." Quantum mechanics has destroyed the old idea of absolute continuity between "cause" and "effect;" for in the transmission of light and in all radiant energy we cannot prove any stuff or any materialistic connection between the source of the energy and its absorption: all we know is that the "energy" disappears at one point and reappears at another point; but of its actual existence throughout the intervening interval we have no scientific knowledge whatever. Finally, the principle of uncertainty within the atom, or what is usually called the principle of Indeterminacy as presented by Heisenberg and Bohr, has destroyed the old idea of an iron determinism which nineteenth-century science seemed to consider one of the chief characteristics of Nature.

I suppose that most of my readers will be expecting me to say something about Einstein's theory of relativity. Einstein is a clever mathematician, and briefly his theory has had a history of three phases. It was first put forward in 1905 to "explain" in mathematical style the phenomena of the heavens without any interstellar ether being taken into account: it merely showed that we can get along without any ether. Its second phase appeared some ten years later, and in it Einstein endeavored to state mathematically most of the phenomena of the universe. Just recently the few remaining phenomena which he had to leave out before have now been included in his unified field equations, which profess to state in mathematical terms all the physical behavior of the universe.

The first forms of his theory were little better than truisms, for if there really is no interstellar ether, then we have no method of estimating absolute motion for the earth or any other celestial body—all celestial motion is relative. So far so good. His subsequent mathematical statements have had many eulogies and many critics. At best they are only clever mathematical ways of expressing the relationships between physical entities. They may be the first of their kind; but they will certainly not be the last. For every mathematician capable of following his ingenious equations will want to try his hand at a similar statement of what he regards as physical reality; and in the end we shall have as many different graphs or statements of this sort as there are individual inventors.

No one who is not interested in the ingenious contortions of present-day mathematics ought to lose any sleep over the great furor now being expended over Einstein's work. The real achievements of science, even the real achievements of modern physics, are not thus spread on the front page of the newspaper. But modern science has made wonderful advances within recent years in understanding the methods by which the Creator controls or conducts His universe. And with the triumph of these new discoveries, I imagine that the old stand-pat evolutionists will be having a hard time to keep up with the procession. For with matter visibly disintegrating before our eyes, it will be difficult to persuade us that a constant tendency toward progression among animals and plants is a reasonable idea, especially in view of the multitudinous facts and arguments which are now assisting in refuting this old idea of constant progress or development.

Berrien Springs, Michigan

Evolutionists are mere squatters on the territory of geology,—on the territory of all natural science for that matter. This whole field of knowledge by long preemptory right belongs to evangelical Christianity; and in view of the numerous wonderful facts now at our command we ought to serve notice on these squatters that it is about time for them to move on.

Never think that God's delays are God's denials. Hold on, hold fast, hold out. Patience is genius.—*Ruskin*.

The Church in Europe

FREDERICK HASSKARL, M.A., B.D.

Communism, Liberalism, and the Church

WHAT a peculiar combination of words:—"Communism, Liberalism, and the Church!" The Rev. Dr. Hans Brandenburg, Professor and author, of Lubeck, Germany, imparts thought-provoking information regarding the three. We translate from one of his original German contributions:

More than ever during the past years the attention of Christendom has been drawn to the conditions and developments of affairs in Russia. The flight of German peasants in great numbers, the intense warfare against all religious organizations, the horrifying news items about mass executions awake in the most of us the impression of an incipient anti-Christ movement. The Russian taskmasters claim that their warfare against religion is not the purpose, but the means. The goal, which is aimed at, through violent reforms, is a society without class distinction, in which there are no factions, but only brothers. In order to attain this goal every means is just; and everything dear, which seems to obstruct the attaining of this goal, must be destroyed, be it love for one's native land or family ties, be it religiosity or private property. Although much arbitrariness or spontaneous hatred and revenge become motivating in the individual—even these are to be put into the service of the great idea of "Collectivism," where the individual is really nothing, and the mass is everything. Humanity is nothing else but a powerful machine, in which there are smaller and larger screws, also large flywheels and central shafts and axles, but *per se* the screw, the wheel, the shaft, the axle mean nothing, absolutely nothing.

New parts can easily be supplied. As in a machine, which does not function correctly, individual parts are removed and from the old material new are made, which function better—just so it is with revolutions on a

large scale. Warfares of annihilation, utter destruction of differing classes and groups are necessary. Whatever hinders the machine is simply filed off. Large and smoothly running shafts on the other hand are well greased and highly regarded. Such a large and important driving shaft was, for instance, Lenin, as he was called even in the Bolshevistic press itself.

That is in general a picture of Collectivism, which denies the individual's right to his own existence and his own interests. In the place of humanity it sets up merely a soulless institution.

However, every human caricature is but a distortion of a truth. So too the collectivism of Moscow is, according to the law of the pendulum, a reactionary manifestation which has broken in upon us.

It is the answer to the atomizing of society through a liberalized citizenry. Even the citizenry at the height of its florescence in the late middle ages knew that men as a separate individual could not dare to oppose society in its collectivity, but should seek his task in becoming a member of the whole. However, as a result of a rationalistic world conception there entered into the citizenry of the nineteenth Century *Liberalism*, which proclaimed the sovereign majesty of the independent personality and in its ultimate consequence signified the war of all against all. Today one laments the "infinite divisions in the civic camp" and overlooks, that that is the logical sequence of an education to "the free personality," which expects from "the free (liberal) play of its powers" its personal life-satisfaction and which regards society as a whole only as a means to the end. In a word the individual is primary, society is secondary.

This coercive blasting of all ties in the name of a bloodless idea has made man of today solitary; he is isolated. The "Message"

of collectivism, as bloody as it is, sounds to its devotee as "the Gospel" itself. That it will not fulfill its sanguine hopes, we need not look to Russia, awaiting the latest news.

For us—believers in Jesus Christ—the instant question arises: Today, as never before, what about society, that sense of gregariousness which makes me one with all humankind, because I have been created in the image of God? *Man cannot bear the "isolation" as individual or personality*, much as it may tickle his vanity. Think of such expressions as "The experience of the moment," "City-life," "Modern Factory," "Apartments," "In the Trenches," "Prisoners' Camp," "Modern Warfare," and we are brought face to face with the "liberalized" modern human.

Does that vast host of Christians of today have an answer to these questions? Are we not responsible for an answer, as witnesses, to the Gospel of Jesus the Christ, in a language of deeds, understandable to our day and generations? At first glance, it seems that the answer should be negative. For there are many, even loyal Christians of deep faith, who regard Christianity as a matter of the soul of the individual, which indeed is carried on from one to another by words of mouth, which frees one from the despair so common to life, and which indeed puts one into an inner contact and understanding with the like-minded. However, in the last analysis it is "world-conception" (*Weltanschauung*) that becomes the norm and standard for the things of the world. So too faith imparts to the individual his world-conception. Now liberalism as a life-conception has taken hold of the Christian Gospel and has split it up into divers doctrinal opinions and theological tendencies.

How far we have gone adrift from the Gospel of the Apostles and the immediate disciples of Jesus! To St. Paul the "Church of Jesus Christ" is not primarily a means to awaken the individual to Faith, to strengthen him therein and to increase his growth in sanctification. On the contrary the primitive (original) Gospel had the church or congregation as its goal. The individual was a building stone, which as building material was to serve to erect the "Temple of the Spirit."

If the Christianity of our day is successful in leading us back to the original Gospel message, it has indeed in a special manner a mandate from God. For pure Christianity

knows a way of salvation from individualism and the atomizing of society. She not only needs to hear a few preachers at Pentecost proclaim the miracle of the Spirit of God; she needs not only to announce "a doctrine concerning the Church," but of all things should translate into concrete form something of the powers of the brotherhood which Jesus gives to us. Neither communistic settlements nor civic organizations would be necessary; but, above all things, the courage to gather unitedly in congregations of Faith.

Now that does not mean groups with their officials and officialdom; it means congregations of brethren, containing not only the "perfected," but the "weak" and the "strong." Of course, their services consist foremost of sermon, hymn and prayer, but all this should lead to active helpfulness, to common battle against evil for edification. Our confession of Faith should not console itself with the great truth, that the true Church is "invisible." The doctrine concerning the practical life of the Christian cannot permit us to place an "individualistic ethic" along side a "socialistic ethic." All that misses the mark; it is to be one in Christ Jesus.

The world has a right to learn to say again as it once said when it looked at the congregation or Church of Christ: "How they do love one another."

A Share Waiting

"Have ye received the Holy Ghost since ye believed?" (Acts 19:2). Evidently there is a reception of the Holy Ghost over and beyond that which first brings us to believe in Jesus. Therefore I put it to you, in all earnestness, hast thou received thy share in thy Father's gift? If not, it is waiting for thee today in the hands of the living Saviour, and thou hast but to claim it and it will be thine.—*Dr. Meyer.*

Put All in God's Hands

A friend went one morning to Sir Robert Peel's house and found him with a great bundle of letters lying before him, bowed over it in prayer. The friend retired, and came back in a short time and said, "I beg your pardon for intruding upon your private devotions." Sir Robert said: "No; those were my public devotions. I was just giving the affairs of state into the hands of God, for I could not manage them." Try trusting the living God with your letter-bag or your housekeeping.—*H. W. Webb-Peploe, D.D.*

THE PULPIT

JAMES M. GRAY, D.D.

I. M. HARGETT, D.D.

ELMER ELLSWORTH HELMS, D.D.

FLOYD TOMKINS, D.D., LL.D.

MILTON HAROLD NICHOLS, D.D.

WALTER D. BUCHANAN, D.D., LL.D.

CLARENCE EDWARD MACARTNEY, D.D.

REV. CARLTON R. VANHOOK

THOMAS S. BROCK, S.T.D.

God's Supreme Purpose for Man

The Certainty of God and His Thought of Us

HAROLD PAUL SLOAN, D.D.

The Church, which is His body, the fullness of Him that filleth all in all.—Ephesians 1:23.

ALL about us is the universe, a frame so vast we cannot think it. Science tells us of its innumerable stars, and of its vastly extended spaces; but both are ideas beyond our comprehension.

John Tyndall, speaking of this vast mystery and its cause, said:

Standing before this cause, this energy from which the universe forces itself upon me I dare not do other than speak of a He.

And the human mind can never think otherwise than that an infinite He, an infinite personality, is behind both ourselves and this mighty frame in which we have our being. We hold that this is certainty: In so far as our minds can experience any certainty concerning the realities which are without us, God is reality. God is more real than the worlds which manifest Him. He is eternal mind; worlds are His thought, His words.

But this truth is not that to which we would direct your attention. Our truth is just beyond it. It is that this infinite Personality, in whose thought and will the boundless universe rests secure like a sleeping child upon the bosom of its mother, that this infinite Personality thinks of you and me. He seeks us. He purposes concerning us.

He puts a value upon us. Just now He is measuring the life that day by day we are living. Our deeds, our words, our unexpressed thoughts, all these He knows and He is putting an estimate upon them morally. Yes, the Infinite thinks of us! What is He thinking?

The answer to this question is our Gospel. The goodness of the purpose of the Infinite toward us is our hope. The infinite God thinks and purposes concerning us sublimely.

This truth is too familiar to us for us to hope that we can add anything to that which you already know; but perhaps we can put this grandeur of God's will toward us in a new setting so that you will realize it with new power. There are four ideas that we will bring to you:

1. The greatness of God's will toward us seen in the greatness of His thought in us.
2. The greatness of God's will toward us seen in the fact of His self-revelation to us.
3. The greatness of God's will toward us seen in the greatness of His sacrifice for us.
4. The greatness of God's will toward us as He Himself has revealed it.

THE GREATNESS OF GOD'S WILL TOWARD US SEEN IN THE GREATNESS OF HIS THOUGHT IN US

In our physical life we are a part of nature, indeed, we are but a small frail part of it compared to the magnitudes about us; but our personalities tower above these magnitudes as the sky lifts above the earth.

We see the same bright spots in the sky that the animals look upon, and of the two the animals may see them best, for their eyes are often more powerful; yet they see only bright spots, while we see worlds and stars. We count their number, we measure their orbits, we chart their cycles, we tell their substances and weights. It is the power of personality, the majesty of that image which God has put in us.

Physically we may indeed be weak, but in personality we are giants. Read the story of Bishop Asbury, the man of frail pain-racked body, who for fifty years veritably lived in the saddle. He made America his parish and travelled through it year after year, from the lakes to the gulf, from the sea to what

was then the far frontier beyond the Alleghenies. Preaching Christ in the cottage of the pioneer or in the open under the sky, this small man of unfaltering devotion and magnificent courage gathered about himself a militant group of a thousand preachers and with them in half a life time built a church of a quarter of a million members.

I stood by his grave one summer, down in Mt. Olivet cemetery, in Baltimore. How little and frail it was! A slender shaft of marble; a short inscription; a bit of sod; underneath, his silent mouldering dust; above, a name! I was shocked at this awful littleness. I asked myself, can these things—this dust—explain Asbury? A thousand voices within me shouted an emphatic, No! No! This small bit of silent dust was not Asbury. Asbury was not his frail body. Asbury was personality. Asbury the personality had not died; he had never entered the tomb. I saw the majesty of God's purpose in us. I saw man's spirit-mind as something distinct from his body; something that energized it, used it. I saw man expressing himself through his body as he might through his coat or his cane; and as completely transcending it. Oh, no, we are not just crumbling dust. We are spirit-minded. We are God-like. We are immortal.

And the grandeur of it all filled my heart with wonder. It was raining, but I forgot the rain. I took off my hat, and standing there bare-headed in the storm, I breathed the words of the Apostles' Creed.

I believe in God the Father!

I believe in Jesus Christ His only Son, our Lord!

I believe in the resurrection of the body and life everlasting! Amen!

It is the majesty of personality. It is the majesty of God's thought in us. And how great must be His purpose toward us when His purpose in us is so sublime.

THE GREATNESS OF GOD'S PURPOSE TOWARD US SEEN IN THE FACT OF HIS SELF REVELATION TO US

It is a demonstration of the greatness of God's thought of us that he has revealed to us Himself. The Psalmist cries out in wonder at God's knowledge of him:

Whither shall I flee from thy presence? If I ascend up into heaven, thou art there. If I make my bed in hell, behold, thou art there. If I take the wings of the morning, and dwell in the uttermost parts of the sea; Even there shall thy hand lead me, and thy right hand shall hold me. If I say, Surely the darkness shall cover me; even the night shall

be light about me. Yea, the darkness hideth not from thee: but the night shineth as the day: the darkness and the light are both alike to thee.—Such knowledge is too wonderful for me; it is high, I cannot attain unto it.

But the mystery to us is not that God knows us. This is the inevitable consequence of His deity: The mystery is that He has given us to know Him, that he has revealed Himself to us. Francis of Assisi preached to the birds; we smile at his simplicity; but did you ever stop to think that God almighty would be equally absurd save for the fact that God made us so wonderfully that He can reveal Himself to us.

God has revealed Himself to us and this is a proof of the greatness of His thought of us. God's revelation is in three forms:

He is revealed naturally in every human heart. All religion is an expression of man's inbuilt sense of God, God's revelation of Himself in us.

He is revealed supernaturally in the Bible. Men open its pages and feel the presence of God. They wonder. They worship. No learning will ever lose the Bible. Through all the years it has spoken and will yet speak to the souls of men. It is God's revelation to us.

But there is yet another divine self-revelation. He reveals Himself supernaturally to those who put their trust in Him. St. Paul's sense of God coming to him tenderly in the inner cry, "Abba Father" was God revealing Himself. It is a common experience of all converted hearts.

The form of this experience will vary according to our place in history and His providential purpose for us; but all down the years God has been supernaturally speaking to men. Francis of Assisi saw Him in the face of a crucifix that seemed to look on him with grace. Wesley felt Him as an inner certainty that warmed His heart. A modern professor who had been groping amid the confusions of present day university life became aware of Him in the experience of be-reavement. He knew the reality of God and immortality but knew not how he knew.

Oh, yes, God reveals Himself to us. The beauty of that experience of forgiveness and of joy that came to your own heart when you knelt and prayed and trusted can never perish from your memory.

It is idle to try to explain it. It is an inward certainty like love. It needs but to be experienced to be understood. God has revealed Himself to us, and this very fact won-

derfully expresses the grandeur of His thought of us.

THE GREATNESS OF GOD'S PURPOSE TOWARD
US SEEN IN THE GREATNESS OF HIS
SACRIFICE FOR US.—John 3:16

It is the word of the cross. It is consummate. "He that spared not His own Son, but delivered Him up for us all, shall He not with Him also freely give us all things?" "What shall separate us from the love of God?" There is no exhausting this truth. God's purpose toward us is as high as the Throne; for it reached to the Throne to find the sacrifice for our redemption. God sacrificing Himself to save His creatures.

This is dizzy. It is incomprehensible; but there is a word in Isaiah which brings it nearer. The prophet writes: "In all their affliction He was afflicted" (Isaiah 63:9); and in the light of this truth we can understand. God sacrifices Himself for us because we are so near Him that forever He suffers with us in all our suffering. God is not far from us, frail though we be. He is near us. He is our father. He is God the Father Almighty. O, here is truth at its summit: Man the creature so near the infinite God that our sufferings and woes are His.

"In all our affliction He is afflicted." He is afflicted!—God suffers in all suffering. From the first sin and the first pain to this moment God suffers. And so sin brought age-long sacrifice into the life of God. And the cross is the consummate expression of this suffering. In the cross God takes all suffering, all guilt, all judgment up into His own life. He takes it that He might free us. O wonderful God! How great must be His purpose toward us, who has sacrificed so vastly for us!

THE GREATNESS OF HIS PURPOSE TOWARD
US AS HE HIMSELF HAS REVEALED IT

Jesus said in His High Priestly prayer (John 17:24) "Father, I will that they also, whom thou hast given me be with me where I am that they may behold my glory; that thou hast loved me before the foundation of the world."

No human words can express the depth of meaning that is hidden here. John tries in the Revelation. His descriptions make us dizzy, but they fail to make the final glory intelligible to our minds. The glory of the Triune God! The glory of infinite perfect eternal love! How can we be near it? How can we understand it? Suppose a mother

should pray thus for her infant daughter, "Father, I will that this child shall feel and understand all the supreme things of womanhood and motherhood!" How long it would be before that prayer can be fulfilled! What power has a little child to enter into the mystery of a mother's experiences? We remember our first impressions of some of the big places of life. We went to a wedding. We grasped two people dressed up, a preacher, refreshments. We went to a funeral. We caught the awe of a silent face and form, tears, whispering voices, a ride, a mystery.

Oh, yes, there are indeed reaches of experience that must be felt before a child can comprehend the heights and depths of motherhood! And what must be the reaches of experience by which we can come up into comprehension of the mystery of the eternal glory of God? Well indeed did the poet write:

So onward we move, and save God above
None guesses how wondrous the journey will prove.

The prodigal son knew his father's goodness well enough to dare to come home; but it was long afterward before he came to understand that amazing grace which opened the family circle and put him in at the center. It was the latter attitude however which displayed the real quality of his father's love. What changes would have to be wrought in him before he could understand it!

It is the same with us. Our destiny is to be the brothers of Christ, members of the family of God. God has opened to us the glory of His Trinity, and bidden us to enter in; share all; rejoice in all. O, God the Father loves us as He loves His only begotten Son! Jesus said so; and St. Paul, catching the glory of the truth saw men so united to Christ that they stood in the Son—yes, as the Son—in the majesty of the Trinity of God. He is the head of the body, and the body with its head—in its head—is the "fullness of Him who filleth all in all."

The Church is Christ. He pervades it, exalts it, glorifies it; but, thus ennobled, He lifts it to share the sublimity of Life's eternal mystery: the glory of the Trinity, the eternal love of God for God. Here is creation's crowning. God is uttered, and man the creature is lifted to comprehend the utterance. He shares with his Creator the wonder of that trinity of holy love of which the unbounded universe is the poem and song.

Haddonfield, New Jersey

For Your Scrap Book

REVEREND A. WALLACE COPPER, A.B.

The Age of Franklin

BENJAMIN FRANKLIN lived in a time of intellectual uneasiness. While Franklin was still cutting candle wicks, Voltaire, twelve years the elder, was serving a sentence in the Bastille for writings objectionable to the authorities of his time and country. Six years later than Franklin were born two other heretical men of the period, Jean Jacques Rousseau, whose "Social Contract" lay down disturbing principles for all governments that they should be based on the consent of the governed; and Frederick the Great of Prussia, who accepted and taught the new theory that, "a king is the first servant of the people." Newton had already established a novel science of theoretical mechanics; Watt was shortly to discover the steam engine; Spinoza had written a new philosophy in Holland, and the skeptical writings of Lord Shaftsbury and Anthony Collins were finding an ever-widening circle of readers.

When Franklin was an infant the most conspicuous writer in the American colonies was the Rev. Cotton Mather. A few years before Franklin's birth, the mischief set afoot by eight silly and illiterate Massachusetts girls, who used to meet and giggle hysterically in the dark of the moon had reached a maniacal climax in the Salem Witch persecution of 1692. Yes, beyond a doubt the intellectual atmosphere of Franklin's day was, to say the least, disturbing. —*Franklin, the first civilized American*—Phillips Russel.

Primitive Religion*

IT is the opinion among anthropologists that religion in some form or other is universal. Explorers have frequently brought accounts of people with no religion. However, a more thorough investigation has not sustained their report. In many cases their conclusion was based upon inadequate observation. Many tribes kept their religious

practices from the traveler and only divulged them after being assured of the integrity of the visitor. No tribe or people have been discovered who do not practice something that answers the purpose of religion, whether or not some groups think it respectable enough to be defined by that name.

Archaeology has given us the records of Egypt, Babylonia and Assyria which in turn give many glimpses of the religions of the nations with which they came in contact. From the Greek historians and geographers we have accounts not only of the religions of the civilized people of their time but of many barbarous tribes in all parts of the world. They nowhere discovered a non-religious people. We have archaeological records that give us at least a partial insight into the religious life of man for ten thousand years. This is a conservative estimate. Archaeology has not uncovered sufficient evidence concerning the paleolithic man. However, we must say, in order to be true to the scientific findings that races that lived on a lower plane of culture had religion; that among the remains of paleolithic culture are certain evidences which must unhesitatingly be interpreted as religious.

The limitation of primitive's man's religion was in what the psychologists call "personifying apperception." They projected themselves and their emotions which were aroused by their experience into the object of the experience itself. Thus, when the swollen waters of the stream swept away his little fortune; when the rock hurtled down the mountain side in his path; when the bolt of lightning struck his companion; when a tornado like some furious monster uproots the forest and destroys the habitation of men, it meant to do it and only did it after dark plotting. That was serious limitation of primitive religious thinking. There was no object in the savage world that by nature was incapable of doing things and whatever was done was planned. In some parts of our world a threatening storm is actually fought by weapons and all the gestures of the uproar of a battle. In certain parts of China a

* *The Growth of Religion*—A. E. Moore.

similar means is employed to fight off an eclipse of the sun.

Men found it difficult to describe the soul or even define it. When Odysseus tried to embrace the shade of his mother she flitted from his arms like a shadow or a dream. If a man should ask himself what stuff souls are made of the thing that naturally suggests itself is something like the atmosphere, and this is the common notion of the soul; it is spirit.

Primitive culture believed that souls had the same needs as living men, so food and drink were provided for them. Weapons, tools, utensils, domestic furniture were placed in the tomb; wives and slaves were buried with the great so as to accompany and serve them.

When Portuguese sailors and traders began to visit the west coast of Africa they found the natives wearing suspended about them small shells or tips of horn sealed up. They rightly inferred these were worn for the same reason they wore amulets or a medallion, properly blessed for protection or good luck. Accordingly they called the amulets of the negroes by the name they used for their own, *fetico*, and the word has passed into other European languages as *fetich* or *fetish*.

Spinoza

SPINOZA, whom Renan called the greatest Jew of modern times lived in Holland and polished lenses for a living. While polishing lenses he kept thinking great thoughts and writing them down. Louis XIV offered him a pension if he would dedicate one of his books to him. Spinoza did not believe in him and refused. So he lived on and died in poverty. Spinoza loved plain living and high thinking. He loved wisdom.

Balzac

BALZAC created the psychological novel. His works take in the whole sphere of human comedy. He was a dull boy in school and showed no early promise. He had one supreme ambition, namely, to write. He would say, "I have a desire I can't satisfy." Love and fame lured him. If ever a boy had difficulties to face it was Balzac. Poverty, early failure, ridicule, toil. Always in debt, always entangled in lawsuits, always pursuing his lover. The determination to win never left him. Finally he did win.

Paderewski

PADEREWSKI is an artist, but think of the toil he confesses to have put into his art. He practiced ten hours a day for twenty years. Success with him has been the hardest kind of grind.

The Etruscans *

THERE is a good deal of evidence to substantiate the theory that early Rome was conquered by the Etruscans. The ritual and ornaments of the supreme authority at Rome appear to be of Etruscan origin. There are traces of early skill and activity in the buildings at Rome; walls and sewers evidence their being constructed under the direction of foreign influence. The idea of a primeval kingship is more than a theory. There is a widespread belief on the part of many classical scholars that the land was under the domination of Etruscan princes.

As to the actual origin of Rome all we are really sure is it was not built in a day. Livy's postulations as to the origin of the mighty empire are not taken seriously anywhere. However, the wolf represented with Romulus and Remus is of ancient origin.

The Etruscans were a mysterious people. As far as we know they came from nowhere in particular and were as aboriginal as any European people. It is true that we cannot make out much of their language but that was true of the aboriginal Cretans and many others. We have some prehistoric polygonal masonry, a beehive tomb and several vases. The later Etruscan work is finer and seems very much akin to that of Greece. In bronze work they were skillful. They developed painting to a high pitch for those early times. Their pottery is similar to that of Greece.

From all accounts they were superstitious and cruel. It is believed the Romans learned much cruelty from them. The insignia of the royalty at Rome, the toga with the purple border, the sceptre of ivory, the curule chair, the twelve lictors with axes; all of these have been borrowed from the Etruscans. It does seem clear the earliest Roman art is of Etruscan origin.

* *The Grandeur that was Rome*—J. C. Stobart.

The way to gain a good reputation is to endeavor to be what you desire to appear.—*Socrates*.

Young People's Department

REVEREND HAROLD JOHN OCKENGA, B.A.

Judges of Ancient and Modern Israel

BELIEVING in the continuity of the Olive tree or the people of God throughout the ages, the Editor feels that a study of men who endured the same conditions now extant in the church will be very profitable. He has written upon the Biblical Characters himself and has assigned the Reformers to those who are most interested in them and most competent to write upon them.

The topics yet to be printed are:

- I. Calvin, or, Predestination.
- II. Wesley, or, Spiritual Life the Basis of Reform.
- III. Edwards, or, American Religious Thought.
- IV. Moody, or, Evangelism.

Topic for May 3, 1931

Samuel, or the Need of a Conversion

Scripture: I Sam. 3

Introduction

IHAVE been a Christian all my life." "I was baptized when I was a child." "I joined the church when I was twelve years old." These and similar statements are being heard every day by ministers who are dealing with the vital phases of salvation. People do not seem to know what it means to be saved. Environment, home training, and church relationships have come to be substituted for a knowledge of salvation.

In the character for study we find a gathering in one of all these characteristics. Hannah and Elkanah were godly parents, quite unlike the majority of our modern generation. They believed in prayer, they believed in the value of the family, and they believed in God. In the same breath in which Samuel's life was asked from God it was also dedicated to God. "Lord, if thou wilt give me a man child, then I will give him unto the Lord all the days of his life." If home training means anything; if environment or intellectual training; if baptism or dedication, certainly these were connected with Samuel's life. If anyone had a chance to be brought up in the faith without an experience of conversion, Samuel had that chance.

Samuel himself seemed to have an inherent capacity for religious faith. When he came to the temple, the first thing he must have perceived was the irreligious and wicked lives of the two sons of Eli, Hophni and Phinehas. Their sins are recorded as including two main transgressions, they ate of the forbidden things, that is, they broke the laws of God, and they committed adultery in the temple, or they broke the laws of nature. For this reason God providentially brought Samuel to the temple to be prepared to succeed these men who were to be cut off. If such was the condition of things

within the temple among the priesthood what must it have been among the people generally? Israel had fallen to a low and degrading position.

Seeing their profession and their hypocritical lives it would have been easy for Samuel to have denounced the whole system as hypocrisy and unworthy of a good man's presence. But Samuel saw beyond the shams of religion into the realities. He realized that he himself could not hide behind the sins of another, but that he must answer to God personally for his acts and his beliefs. Another man's hypocrisy is the most prevalent excuse for irreligious lives today, but we ought to remember that if we are to hide behind anything we have to be smaller than it. Samuel realized that he had to deal personally with God.

The history of Israel was a history of bondage and of deliverance. First, God gave them a leader whom they followed in righteousness and truth. But when this leader was gone they invariably slipped into sin and soon were back in the bondage. When the bondage became heavy their cries for deliverance again rose to God. Sometimes God could not find a man but had to raise one up. Such was the case now. Consequently we have the history related in the first three chapters of I Samuel, telling of how God first prepared a mother and then He received His man. The mother was Hannah. The man was Samuel.

1. "Samuel did not yet know the Lord."

The first great discovery that came to Samuel in the temple as a youth was that he could not get along on his parents' religion. Even though he had every opportunity to be religiously inclined, yet he did not yet know the Lord. To know the Lord means to experience a personal knowledge of Him which is identical with salvation. Just as parents do today, so Elkanah and Hannah did everything they could for Samuel, but it was not sufficient to save him. The narrative even hints that they thought he was all right once they had committed him to the temple. They thought that if he were educated in the temple and were dedicated to God and that if they supplied his physical needs, he would truly know God. They did all that parents could do, but Samuel did not yet know the Lord.

Explicitly the Scripture states that "the Word of the Lord was not yet revealed unto him." It may have been to others, but it was not to Samuel. As he turned the pages of the Pentateuch it was all a mystery to him. He was in the condition which marks the state of over half of our nominal Christians today. The Bible is a closed book; God is not real; and all this is because the Spirit has not accomplished His personal work in the heart.

2. "And God called Samuel."

There came a time in the process of this training when the expectations of parent hearts were fulfilled. Samuel was sleeping. What a parable this is

upon many lives today! Some people are asleep half of the time, others are half asleep all of the time, and spiritually the majority is asleep all of the time. Samuel needed something to wake him up. With him, it was the call of God coming directly to his ears. With us, it is God's Word in its aspects of wrath and judgment from which we should flee.

Samuel had aroused in him a desire for a personal satisfaction from a personal God. This comes at some time to every man. God awakens him and puts within his heart a desire that He alone can satisfy. What if Samuel had groaned and turned over and had gone back to sleep! Yet this is literally what we do. We say, "I'll take my chance," or "When I get outside of the meeting-house, I'll be all right, this is just emotionalism." But Samuel acknowledged that the call was there by getting up and going to Eli.

3. "And he ran to Eli."

Notice that Samuel was ready to answer. He sprang out of bed and ran. He was in an attitude of expectancy. It is my opinion that the modern youth of America are in an attitude of expectancy concerning God, but that the challenge and the call is not presented to them.

Notice again that Samuel ran in the wrong direction. It was God that called him, but he ran to Eli. He misunderstood the call. In like manner, our young people today are deceived into thinking that the call of God, or the call to personal satisfaction in Him, is the call to riches, or to popularity, or to pleasure, and they run in the wrong direction.

Notice also that Samuel returned disappointed. Three times he laid his weary head upon his pillow and said to himself, "I wonder what is the matter with me. I heard someone call. I must be mistaken." How many times we have returned from our pleasurable frolics, our pursuit of riches, and our popular pastimes to say, "What a fool I am! I must be going in the wrong direction." And yet the right direction is not perceived.

4. "And the Lord came and stood and called Samuel, as at other times."

Each time Samuel lay down he heard the call of God again. One would think that God would have become tired of waiting, yet how patient and how pleading He is! Each time we come back from a new trial of the world, we hear the restless, uneasy, sleepless thoughts repeated in our attentive ears. God is calling us to Himself.

The third time that Samuel went to Eli, the old man perceived that God was calling the child. He then pointed him the way to life. If Eli had failed this time also, who knows but what Samuel would never have listened to the call again? What a responsibility rests upon those who know the Way to tell others what the restless turmoil that marks their lives really is and how it can be satisfied.

Conclusion

Samuel said, "Speak, Lord, for Thy servant heareth." And God spoke. God gave him a message to the world, God made him the greatest man in the land, and God satisfied the hungry longing of his youthful soul. What Samuel experienced in that hour when he said "Yes" to God, the writer knows that he has experienced and he trusts that everyone who reads this lesson will also experience and know.

Questions

1. To what extent does or should environment influence personal religion? Discuss the environment of Moses, of David, of Paul, and of other great religious souls.

2. Into what terms is the call of God translating itself in the twentieth century? To whom does the duty fall of interpreting this call?

3. What relation does the knowledge of the Word of God have to a knowledge of God and a satisfaction of one's spiritual desires?

Lesson Hymn: "Wherewith O Lord shall I draw near," by Charles Wesley.

Topic for May 10, 1931

Samson: the Strong Man Spoiled

Scripture: Judges 13-16

Introduction

HISTORY during the period of the Judges moved in circles. The people of God began with a trust in the Almighty, which resulted in prosperity and liberty. But soon, while enjoying these privileges, they forgot God and slipped into bondage to their enemy. In bondage periods their prosperity waned and dire need set in. Soon they were again earnestly calling on God for deliverance. A Gideon, a Jephthah, or a Samson appeared in answer to their prayer and the circle started all over again.

The history of the life of one of these judges is the lesson before us today. A Danite farmer and his wife were working in the fields of Zorah when the Philistines were the oppressors of Israel. The farmer's name was Manoah, but the name of the woman is unknown. She is placed on a plane with Sarah, Elizabeth, Hannah, and Rachel in the wonder of the story concerning her. Bearing in her life the Jewish disgrace of being childless, she nevertheless apportioned a season of the day for meditation and prayer in quietude. It was during this period that the angel of God visited her with a startling message.

This angel was recognized by her because he was a prophet of God. He told her the truth about her life. Then he added that she also should have a son, but that her son would be different from other men. It is important to notice that God not only prepared this woman by years of meditation and mellowing, but that He also commanded her concerning her way of life. She was to drink no strong drink and eat no unclean thing and should train her child as a separate and peculiar child for God. When will mothers learn the lesson here given? If they are to have men who are to move the world, they cannot indulge in what others consider harmless. God has ordained that such women must be different. Mrs. Manoah was.

Interesting it is to note how Manoah received this message. It was his desire that the angel should return unto him and verify his statements lest the woman should have forgotten something. And again he returned, but again to the woman alone in the field. This time she brings the angel to Manoah who is thereby led to God by the weaker vessel. This Malcah, or angel of God, was none other than an epiphany of the Lord Jesus Christ.

1. The Spiritual Life of Samson

His birth was as the coming of the sun and they called him Shemesh or Samson, typifying the rising sun or the beaming of the countenance of the angel of God. How like Moses he must have been in his birth. Under the blessing of God he grew and waxed strong and stayed in the deserts. How like to the narratives of the youth of John the Baptist and Jesus. There came times when the Spirit of God moved him in the camp. During the contests of strength when strength was an object lesson to men, the Spirit of God enabled Samson to perform a feat seemingly impossible to men. It was the generation of the infancy of human development when brawn appealed to men. Samson was the strongest man in the world, but his strength depended upon his Nazarite vows. He was different from the others. He had long hair, he drank no wine, and his lips were pure. Thus his early life was formed under a consciousness of the presence of God's Spirit.

Samson now became a public figure, he became identified with the nation of Israel. Being providentially incited of God, he fell in love with a Philistine woman, that ultimately through him the Philistine yoke might be broken. Many are the beautiful lessons of parental obedience and respect which we may learn from this courtship of Samson. At the wedding feast Samson propounded a riddle to the young men present. The dull Philistines failed to comprehend it and wormed the answer from Samson's betrothed. This was the first cause for a beginning of national hostility. Samson left. The mixed marriage ended in failure. The woman was given to his best man, and a public affront had been made to Israel.

This was the beginning of the contests which were to deliver Israel. First, Samson slew thirty Philistines. Then he burned their crops with fire. Finally he slaughtered them hip and thigh until the army of the Philistines was wasted. Their shouts of triumph were turned into shrieks of terror, and Israel was delivered by Samson. He judged them for twenty years in righteousness and strength, keeping his Nazarite vows.

2. The Sin of Samson

Sin came to him through the lust of the eyes. He sinned while God was depending on him to be His judge and His representative among the people. While he nursed the serpent in his bosom, his enemies compassed the city about to kill him. (Read Judges 16). All one needs to do is to give the devil a foothold and he soon gets a strangle hold. While we play in sin and sleep in its pleasures, our enemies are ready to slay us. Awakened by his conscience in the night, and feeling miserable because of his failure, he arose, repented, trusted in God and saved the day.

But sin was easier the second time. He fell in love with another Philistine woman, Delilah. It is a sad story, a page which we wish were never written about him. He fell very low. We speak about it because in the midst of it is perhaps the greatest text of the whole story. As his infatuation for her increased she betrayed him. So it is with all sin. Finally when he had told to her his whole heart and had been stripped of his power, she afflicted him. He arose and shook himself as at other times. But, alas, his strength was gone. He wist not

that the Spirit of God had left him. He stood to meet his enemies and found his power gone and himself helpless. He is a picture of many individuals and of many churches whom the Spirit of God has left and who are unaware of the fact.

The punishment of Samson began where his sin began. First, in his eyes which were put out, and then in his body which became a human horse, he suffered.

3. The Sorrow of Samson

Picture this "sun" of humanity, called Shemesh, down in the prison dungeon, disappointed, broken, and pitiable in contrast to what he once was. Helpless, the object of jeers at a grinder, afflicted in person, blind, fettered in brass, hated and mocked, he had time to think. And the Scripture says, "his hair began to grow." It is the affliction of life that turns us back to God—sickness, financial reverses, loneliness, and suffering. Thank God for the rod.

But the story of Samson does not end here. The Philistines had a public celebration to worship their god Dagon and to mock the God of Samson. Here the depth of his sin was borne in upon Samson. They brought him stumbling, falling, struck at, and helpless, being led by a little lad into their midst. The house was filled with drunken riotous men and women, defying the God of Israel. Samson saw his sin and repented. The prodigal returned to his Father. The Scripture implies that his hair had grown quickly. His strength returned with his vows. With one last petition to God, he put his arms upon the pillars supporting the house, heavy with the thousands of people, and bowed himself with all his might. The house fell, thousands were killed, and Samson died with them.

Conclusion

The strong man came back to God, all backsliders will, if they have truly had the life of God planted in their souls. But what a price Samson paid for his sin! Sorrow, sighing, and punishment is the lot of the backsliding Christian in the chastizing love of a redeeming Father.

Questions

1. Is it essential for spiritual power to be different from the general run of humanity?

2. What is the Scripture teaching about parental obedience, mixed marriages, and hobnobbing with Philistines?

3. Is a Christian identified with Christianity as Samson was publicly identified with Israel?

4. Are there degrees of sin, and is it easier to sin after the first time?

Lesson Hymn: 450 (Presbyterian Hymnal), "Depth of Mercy," by Charles Wesley.

Topic for May 17, 1931

Jephthah: a Foolish Vow and the Questions it Raises

Scripture: Judges 11, 12

Introduction

A MIGHTY man of valor was Jephthah. Such is our introduction to him. His personal history is not without interest for we find that he had an irregular but a religious father of wealth and influence, but his mother was a harlot. Regardless of his parentage this man had a distinctly religious

trend of mind. This training no doubt came from his well meaning but weak father who was willing to endure the results of his sin to the extent that he took Jephthah into his own home and reared him there. One among many brethren, his life was not all rosy. As the boys grew and a consciousness came upon them of the difference between themselves and Jephthah they said, "Thou shalt not inherit in our father's house," and they thrust him out.

He became a wanderer in the land of Tob. Here Jephthah learned the art of leadership for he ruled the vain and wicked men who repaired to him with a firm and determined hand. This preparation was to be the most important for his public service.

Then came the crisis. The children of Ammon made war against the children of Israel, and the elders of Gilead went to fetch Jephthah out of the land of Tob. What an insight this is to the character of those brothers who cast him out. Reared in luxury and selfishness and probably profligacy they were unable to meet the crisis when it came. Jephthah's wrong was now avenged. They came to him beseeching him to return and to become their deliverer.

He was the man of the hour. Publicly the nation installed him as leader and judge at Mizpeh. With his characteristic quick decision he made a personal tour of the tribes of Israel kindling the enthusiasm of the people into a mighty flame. It was a characteristic action of a man of genius. With such a man at the helm victory was assured. The Ammonites were beaten back and Jephthah was the conqueror.

The public life of this man is marred by two great private mistakes. He made a foolish vow which cost him the dearest thing on earth. He raised a shibboleth which destroyed forty thousand lives from among his own people. From him we can learn certain lessons.

1. God is no respecter of persons.

We have laid a hearty and healthy stress on good family and Christian parentage in their influences upon life. Some one may get the idea that because he has been deprived of some of these blessings he has no chance. There are four kinds of people: good children of good parents, bad children of good parents, good children of bad parents, and bad children of bad parents. Jephthah was a mixture, but he made good. The exception to the rule as given in the Scripture is for a purpose, that no one may lose hope.

The question today is not what kind of parentage did you have, but will you believe? "Whosoever believeth shall be saved." "Him that cometh to me I will not cast out." "He that will do the will of God shall know the doctrine." The point of contact between you and God for your salvation or your future service is your will. Whosoever receiveth Him shall receive power to become a son of God, (John 1:12).

2. God does not require unethical service.

Jephthah vowed to give to God the first living thing that met him from his own household on his return from the war. This proved to be his lovely daughter. She came forth dancing to meet him, but instead of bringing him joy she brought him sorrow. Generally it is understood that she was to be put to death as a human sacrifice. This was the general practice of peoples at that time, although it was expressly forbidden among the Jews. The

gates of Jericho were laid with the death of the first born of its king. Among eminent scholars there is a division of opinion as to whether this girl was put to death. Joseph Kinchi suggests that she was shut up in a house that her father had built for the purpose and she was visited by the daughters of Israel four days in each year as long as she lived.

This explanation seems satisfactory to the narratives, but even if she were sacrificed the act has not the sanction of God but is an act of unenlightened piety on the part of Jephthah. It does not bring opprobrium upon the God of Israel but upon Jephthah's lack of spiritual insight.

The same can be said of the other Old Testament problems. Many people stumble over the slaughter of the Amalekites, thinking that such a command was unworthy of God. They forget that it was a beneficent act considering the diseased condition of the people, which if it had not been blotted out would have spread to others. It was a greater mercy that they should die than live.

Others stumble about modern moral problems. Why, they ask, does the New Testament sanction slavery, booze, and war? But the New Testament says nothing about these specific problems. It gives you principles to apply in specific cases. These principles always oppose such evils. If a Christian submits to the practices of his day which are unethical, it is due to his unenlightenment and not to a failure of God.

Conclusion

Jephthah judged Israel until his death. God sustained him in spite of his mistakes and his unenlightenment because Jephthah was willing to do God's will. God is not a respecter of persons. God also has an unchanging standard of morality but His followers are often unenlightened and influenced by the standard of their times. Today as of old we should let the blessings of God flow through us regardless of our background.

Questions

1. On what basis will God respect persons? Is this because of parental teaching? How far does the Bible teach individual responsibility?

2. What is the point of contact for individual salvation?

3. Do you feel that men who stumble over moral questions in the Scripture have approached it with the right attitude?

Lesson Hymn: "Who Is Thy Neighbor?" by Wm. B. O. Peabody.

Topic for May 24, 1931

Gideon: God's Deliverer

Scripture: Judges 6, 7, 8

Introduction

THE threshing season was on, but there was little rejoicing on the part of the people. The Midianites had come up over the land for their usual purpose of plunder. Leaving their crops for destruction the people hid in caves and hollows. But Gideon threshed wheat by the winepress to hide it from the Midianites. As he flayed the grain with rhythmical motion a stranger seated himself on a rock nearby.

"The Lord is with thee, thou mighty man of valor," said the stranger. But Gideon objected to

such a statement because of the condition of the people. Then it was that the angel told him that God had chosen him to deliver them from their condition. His reaction to this call was very parallel to the reaction of Moses to the call of God to deliver Israel from Egypt. He had no confidence in himself. But God assured him of His presence by letting him behold the angel ascend in the fire, (Read Judges 6:11-22).

The first task of Gideon in delivering the people was the act of cutting down the grove of Baal. This was the foreign god now worshipped by the subject people. To cut down the grove was an equivalent to declaring war. Taking ten men with him, Gideon did it at night. The next day a thrill passed through the countryside as the people realized what had been done. But Gideon repaired himself to the presence of God. He wanted assurance that he was acting according to God's plan. "I will put a fleece of wool on the floor and if the dew be on the fleece only then shall I know that Thou wilt save Israel by my hand." So he prayed. The next morning the fleece was soaking wet. But still Gideon was not satisfied. He now wanted the fleece to be dry and the ground to be wet. This was not unbelief, it was mere wisdom. We all know that dew condenses upon the wool when it will not upon the ground. The miracle consisted in the fleece being dry and the ground being wet. When this happened Gideon arose to go.

1. The great need of deliverance

Israel had again slipped into sin and bondage had again resulted. It seemed that they would not learn their lesson.

During this bondage conditions of extreme poverty marked the people. Loose moral relationships existed among the people, mixed marriages with the remaining Canaanites caused wild confusion of religious ideas, and every man did what was right in his own eyes. This was the result of their own failure. God said, "Ye have not obeyed my voice." What a proof this is that their religion was superimposed upon them and not evolved, since they were always falling away from it instead of rising into it. Their failures were defections.

2. The great deliverer, Gideon

Gideon was a poor farmer like Elisha, Amos, and others so often used of God. Luther was a peasant and never ceased glorying in it. Throughout his dealings with the world, God has as a general rule used the weak things to confound the mighty. The rich young ruler turned away from Him. Nicodemus feared to serve Him. But Peter and John and the shepherds were ready.

Gideon's characteristics that fitted him for service consisted of humility, fortitude, faith, vision, and practicability. He was the least in his father's household and in Israel. He was a man of valor. He had faith that God would show him His will. His nobility of character would not allow that he should become a king. He wanted God to rule over them. His honesty revealed his doubts unto the angel. But the peculiar endowment which he possessed for the service of God was none of these. The secret of his success was his spiritual mindedness. He related everything to God. God was first and last in his life.

3. The great deliverance wrought

Innumerable hosts were before the Israelites in

the valley. There were multitudes of Gideon's people there too. In fact, there were too many to let them have the victory lest they vaunt themselves and say that numbers won the victory. Sometimes this may be true concerning our church and our preachers. God looks at them and says they have too many buildings and too many degrees after their name, lest if I deliver the enemy to them they vaunt themselves.

The numbers were pruned. 22,000 were afraid and turned back. If the fearful were pruned from our ranks today about three-fourths of our group would be gone. Then ten thousand more left because they were not aware of the dangers that beset them. They indulged in sensuous delight rather than in stern thought of the danger to their country and the cause of God. Three hundred chosen men were left. The reformers God has always used have been few, but have been prepared, alert, thinking, and keen to the dangers and the results. Three hundred valiant men were left, but they were valiant men who believed in God.

The victory was complete. It was not through men's weapons. Only lights and pitchers and trumpets were used. Insignificant weapons were these, but they were the weapons commanded. We too have weapons, seemingly insignificant, in prayer and the Bible and life, and these are the weapons which God will use. When the few won the battle, the many returned to take the spoil. The neutral men, the men of Succoth, were punished because they would not commit themselves. What parables are these of the Christian life?

Conclusion

Yet there is a war upon Gideon's life even as there are wars upon the lives of many men of God. When he returned to private life he became proud, he lived in luxury, he descended to licentiousness, and the spoils of war became a snare unto him.

Questions

1. Wherein does the church stand in need of deliverance today? What kind of deliverers has God used in the past?

2. From what source do we have a right to look for deliverance both humanly and Divinely speaking? Through what instruments and agencies will God work deliverance for His people today?

Gideon, or God's Deliverer

(Contributed by Frances Thomas)

Have you come to the Red Sea place in your life
Where, in spite of all you can do,
There is no way out, there is no way back,
There is no other way out but—through?
Then wait on the Lord with a trust serene
Till the night of your fear is gone;
He will send the wind, he will heap the floods,
When he says to your soul, "Go on."

And His hand will lead you through—clear through—
Ere the watery walls roll down,
No foe can reach you, no wave can touch,
No mightiest sea can drown;
The tossing billows may rear their crests,
Their foam at your feet may break,
But over their bed you shall walk dry shod
In the path that your Lord will make.

In the morning watch, 'neath the lifted cloud,
You shall see but the Lord alone,
When He leads you on from the place of the sea
To a land that you have not known;
And your fears shall pass as your foes have passed,
You shall be no more afraid;
You shall sing His praise in a better place,
A place that His hand has made.

—Annie Johnson Flint in *S. S. Times*

Library Table

CONDUCTED BY PROFESSOR LEANDER S. KEYSER, A.M., D.D.

A Broadside on Humanism

THE book which shall claim our attention in this article is entitled, *Humanism: Another Battle Line*. It is published by the Cokesbury Press, 810 Broadway, Nashville, Tenn., and is edited by Dr. William P. King. The price is \$2.25.

Some months ago the same firm published a noteworthy book on *Behaviorism: A Battle Line*, which was also edited by Dr. King and which was reviewed in this magazine for February. First, one naturally wonders why the editor selected only theological liberals to write the different chapters of this book. We think the book would have been more effective, and even more logical and forceful, had the writers been thoroughly evangelical. Perhaps the reason for this partisan selection becomes obvious, after all, when you read the Editor's contribution, namely, the last chapter, in which his own liberalistic views come to the fore.

Who's who, then, among the contributors to this volume? They are: Lynn Harold Hough, Douglas C. Macintosh, John Wright Buckham, Shailer Mathews, William Adams Bown (more evangelical than the rest), W. E. Garrison, and several others not so well known. Nearly all of these men take occasion in their articles to give some slams at the orthodox or evangelical view of Christianity and the Bible. Herein lies the weakness of the book, for by these very tokens its effectiveness is greatly marred.

However, we always try to be fair. Therefore we gladly admit that the book is a regular platoon-fire on Humanism. However, the warfare is conducted in a gentlemanly way, and very few epithets, if any, are used, and only a little sarcasm now and then occurs, when it seems to be spontaneous. In the first chapter Dr. Hough gives a history of the word "Humanism," but hardly touches upon the subject of Humanism as it is advocated today. In the second chapter, "Contemporary Humanism," Dr. Macintosh comes more nearly to grips with the subject of Humanism

as it is known today. While he admits that "the term 'humanism' is notoriously ambiguous," yet it has some characteristics that mark it off from everything else. Today Humanism, spelled with a capital H, is that movement which emphasizes the sufficiency of mankind to do all that is necessary for his well-being without recognition of and help from the supernatural. Some Humanists may not be willing to deny the existence of God, but they envisage him so dimly and distantly that they realize no help from Him and do not feel any particular need of Him. Their motto might well be put in Alexander Pope's well-known lines:

Then know thyself; presume not God to scan:
The proper study of mankind is man.

One might add that modern Humanism is practically the same as Confucianism and Taoism in China—it practically ignores God, and has an interest only in man, and that only for the present life-time. This is our own analysis of Humanism, not that of Dr. Macintosh, although we believe it to be the sum and substance of his presentation. Here is something from Dr. Macintosh that is worth considering:

"Of contemporary American anti-theistic Humanism in general, however, the true father—or should we say grandfather—is John Dewey. There are two families of his spiritual children, the Chicago family and the Columbia family." Then Dr. Macintosh says that many quotations from Dewey's works might be cited to "show his antagonism to theism." Any religion which recognizes a "superhuman or superpersonal Power he regards as essentially pre-scientific, a survival of primitive animism." Thus we see that the Dewey brand of Humanism is bound up with the theory of evolution, as is, indeed, every other brand. Dr. Macintosh's chapter is most instructive in that he quotes from many of the outstanding Humanists of the day, and indicates cogently the futility of its claim to

be a religion when it will not recognize the supernatural. That is injecting into the term "religion" another meaning than its historical one. Yet most of the Humanists do not want to be regarded as irreligious! Why not? They have sense enough to see that the religious intuition is a part of man's very nature, and hence cannot be eradicated without dehumanizing mankind.

The chapter contributed by Dr. John W. Buckham, "Humanitarianism and Personalism," is likewise instructive and well argued as long as he confines his attention to the Humanists themselves. He criticizes Walter Lippmann, author of *A Preface to Morals*, who wants to call his view both "high morality" and "high religion," when, after all, he will not acknowledge God. Yet such a philosophy, says Dr. Buckham, "is by no means religion, for it lacks the faith, the motives and the inspirations of religion. Morality and religion are very intimately related and mutually furtherant, but neither can be resolved into the other."

To this we agree, and would add that there may be a kind of social morality without religion, but any morality that is not motivated by love to God and recognition of His mercies and of man's duties to Him, is surely a very defective kind of morality. Here is a salient statement by our author: "Should Humanism, despite the present attitude of its leading representatives, elect to sever itself from religion, it will cut itself off from one of the most humanizing influences, and in so far will defeat its own ends."

It is a pity, however, that Dr. Buckham felt constrained to give a back-handed slam at orthodox theology, and that without even offering a reason for doing so. He says that "orthodox theology, in its teaching about God, has been, and still is, too often either dismally weak or wooden or worse" (p.95). Again: "That is to say, there has been a great deal of vociferous proclamation of God on the part of the unco orthodox that is wholly lacking in that integrity of truth and that 'sweet reasonableness' which alone carries conviction. Such dogmatic and unworthy caricaturing of true faith in God is as ancient as human obtuseness and presumption."

There is more of the same sort, and yet there is no clear definition of the precise "unco orthodox" doctrines that are thus scored and ridiculed. If Dr. Buckham means to rebuke unkindness, we must say that he re-

bukes unkindness in an unkind way, and thus is himself guilty of the very wrong he condemns. It is these gratuitous thrusts at evangelical believers that mars most of the essays of this book.

But we fear that Dr. Buckham himself does not always present the "sweet reasonableness" of the Christian religion. On page 101 he says: "He that has seen Him (Jesus) has seen human personality emerging into the divine, and divine Personality descending into the human."

The last part of this sentence is true enough, if the writer refers to the incarnation of the Son of God; but the first part surely is not correct, for human personality never becomes divine. There is only one divine being, and that is God. Men are human, not divine, even though in the beginning they were created in the divine image. More than that, Christ was not a "human personality." He was a divine Person incarnate in human nature. To say that Jesus emerged into the divine is to repeat an ancient heresy that the evangelical church has always condemned. The human may by God's grace become more and more like the divine in ethical and spiritual qualities, but it is never transubstantiated into the divine; neither are the divine and the human natures ever consubstantiated. Yes, the old theology, though often derided, is deeper and better than the modernistic type.

In spite of some flings at orthodox Christianity and some seemingly pantheistic expressions (like "the personality-producing forces of the universe"), Dr. Shailer Mathews effectively points out the insufficiency of the new Humanism in his chapter on, "Can We Have Religion Without God?" Put in language that has no flavor of pantheism, we would say that his contention is this: Man cannot be religious in any sense worthy of the name unless he seeks to live in recognition of and fellowship with that ultimate Personal Power which has given him his existence in the universe. Put thus theistically (and not pantheistically), surely the argument should be convincing even to the atheistic Humanist.

The essay by Dr. W. E. Garrison on "Humanism: Reactionary Rather than Radical" is likewise strong in its contention against Humanism in favor of the theistic worldview, but shows in some places a decided antagonism to the evangelical position. Its

flings are gratuitous, and do not indicate a judicial attitude toward Biblical religion un-mixed with rationalism. We regret that an otherwise good article should be impaired in this way.

Other chapters of this notable volume are as follows: "Neo-Humanism and Human Need," by Richard Roberts; "Will Humanism Suffice as a Philosophy of Life?" by Ivan Lee Holt; "Humanism and Christianity," by C. B. Wilmer; "Humanism: What It Is and How to Meet It," by William Adams Brown. Most of these articles are convincing.

Perhaps the most pungent chapter of the book is the last one, written by the editor, Dr. William P. King. There are many quotable statements in it. Dr. King does not mean to be sarcastic, he says, and yet the central position of the Humanists seems to him to be so inadequate that he cannot wholly keep the sarcastic tang out of his tones. However, such trenchancy does not mar his article in the least, and may even add to its piquancy. We think that Dr. King gives the clearest conception of present-day Humanism of the genuine kind that is given in the book. He says:

Other contributors to this volume will give the historical background of Humanism. We are concerned with its modern significance in its denial of any supreme or superhuman intelligence and purpose in the universe.

In Humanism "man's chief end is to glorify man and enjoy him forever," he adds. But that is not quite accurate, for most of the Humanists do not believe in any "forever." This statement is true, however: "Unless God is the center of religion, there can be no true religion or worship in any true sense." There is no rational meaning in such expressions as these, which are of a humanistic character: "O thou Integrating Process, hallowed be thy name;" "O thou Principle of Concretion, forgive our sins."

Here is something worth quoting from Dr. King's article:

St. Paul, brooding over the ministry and teaching of Jesus, wrote First Corinthians, and the thirteenth chapter has meant more for the inspiration of worthy conduct than all scientific discoveries since the world began. We do not have to choose between science and religion. If we were compelled to choose, the choice would be religion.

To show what skepticism of religion leads to, Dr. King gives some doleful quotations from H. L. Mencken and James B. Cabell—

quotations which we have already published in an issue of the *Bible Champion*. But here is Professor Barnes' belittling conception of man: "Man is a highly temporary chemical episode on a most petty planet." Further on we shall give a somewhat lengthy excerpt from Dr. King's salient essay.

But why must he hurl stones at the Fundamentalists? For example, note this: "These men (those of the Barnes order) should be very sympathetic toward the Fundamentalists, since they hold to the miracle of mind springing out of the non-mental." Such a canard seems to prove that Dr. King does not have even an elementary knowledge of what Fundamentalists hold. Not one of them on the whole earth's surface holds such an absurd doctrine as that attributed to them. Indeed, they hold the very opposite. According to the Fundamentalist's theology, God is a mental Being—an Infinite and Absolute Mental Being; therefore He created man a finite mental being. That is the precise opposite of the idea that mind springs "out of the non-mental." Man's mental nature did not "spring" at all; it was *created*; more than that, created in the divine image. We confess with regret that no men blunder more egregiously than do the Modernists when they try to characterize orthodox theology. They always caricature it, just as if they had never taken a thorough course of training in evangelical theology.

Dr. King goes lame again when he accepts the doctrine of man's evolution from an animal ancestry. There is no need of disparaging origins in favor of goals; for both are important. A high origin carries with it implicitly the possibility of a high destiny. A low origin may lead to a low conception of destiny; and among the evolutionists it often does that very thing, as witness Barnes, Mencken and Russell; also H. G. Wells. Then think of this from Dr. King:

To have risen from a lower life, however low, seems preferable to having fallen from a higher life, however high.

Now, we will not argue the question, for we have often done that before; but what is the meaning of such a statement? It means a denial of plain Biblical doctrine involving both the Old and the New Testaments. There are Genesis I, II and III, which teach with absolute clarity that man had a high origin and that by sinning he fell from his high estate. Besides, Paul sanctions the doc-

trine of the Old Testament: "As in Adam all die, even so in Christ shall all be made alive" (1 Cor.15:22); "Nevertheless, death reigned from Adam to Moses, even over them that had not sinned after the similitude of Adam's transgression, who is the figure of Him that was to come" (Rom.1:14; see also 1 Tim.2:14).

But enough. We can only wish that Dr. King had not selected a group of liberals to deal with the burning questions relative to the Humanism of our day. We shall next show how effectively he deals with the Humanists when he goes after them in real earnest.

The Futile Character of Humanism

We capture the following trenchant statements from Dr. William P. King, the editor of the volume reviewed in the preceding article (pages 270, 271):

"There are certain Humanists who have imbibed more knowledge than wisdom.

"A modern antagonist of theism, a confessed Humanist, pleads with the Christian church to accept his profound reasoning. He is merciful to the Christian, and offers a prescription by which our faith may have an easy death; if not at the hands of harder-hearted men than he is, faith will suffer a violent death. The same member of the intelligentsia advances the notion that, aside from love for an imaginary God, there would be that much more love left for humanity. He has become so obsessed by the physical that he interprets love according to the mathematics of the material.

"He might as well say that, if a man gave only a meager amount of love to his wife, he would have more left for his children. It appears, on the contrary, that the more a man loves his wife, the greater his love is likely to be for his children.

"Against this baseless theory the facts abundantly demonstrate that it has been the men who love God who have most loved and served men. He would doubtless regard with a measure of scorn the ideas of the ordinary man. But the densest ignorance and most utter lack of common sense belong to scientific experts who are totally absorbed in the physical.

"They fall into scientific pedantry. We

have no desire to be sarcastic, but it appears to us that some of our so-called intelligentsia have been educated beyond their intelligence. The Duke of Wellington is reported to have said to a young man: 'Sir, you have received too much education for your brains.'

"Furthermore, atheism in its humanistic form speaks golden words about a beneficent ministry to humanity; but it walks on leaden feet. Humanism has existed from the days of Comte and before, but we have no record of its achievements in building hospitals and orphanages or in rescuing submerged human beings from the filth and immorality of the slums.

"Prof. R. A. Millikan makes this statement as his observation: 'A very large fraction of the altruistic and humanitarian and forward-looking work of the world, in all its forms, has today its mainsprings in the Christian churches. My own judgment is that about ninety-five per cent of it has come, and is coming directly or indirectly, from the influence of organized religion in the United States. My own judgment is that, if the influence of American churches in the furtherance of socially wholesome and forward-looking movements, in the spread of conscientious and unselfish living of all sorts, were to be eliminated, our democracy would in a few years become so corrupt that it could not endure.' . . .

"Our values 'need reality to climb on.' If there is no great Soul of Goodness at the heart of life, we lose both the obligation and motive power for goodness. . . . 'No obligation can be absolute which does not derive from the absolute.' . . .

"As has been finely said, 'Ideals make lonely dwelling places.' But as we believe that our moral purposes harmonize with the 'scheme of things entire,' and that back of the processes of nature there is an Infinite Will and an Infinite Mind, the soul is fortified with strength that overcomes.

"We are persuaded that our moral values and ethical ideals indicate the nature of Ultimate Reality—that is, we interpret this Reality in terms of the best we know. If this be not true, the lower part of man's personality, by which he is related to the material world, speaks the truth, while the higher part of his personality deals in dreams and delusions. . .

"Wrong doesn't work well in our world. Right is the ultimate reality to which nature

herself gives permanence. Sin has within it the seeds of dissolution, and nature inflicts her penalties. Nature is the agent and ally of God and the good. 'Even the creation waits with eager longing for the sons of God to be revealed.'

"Fierce though the fiends may fight,
Long though the angels hide,
We know that truth and right
Have the universe on their side."

Yes, and we may add, this is so because the personal and righteous God is above and in the universe.—*L. S. K.*

Men of the Great Redemption—By Wm. L. Stidger

(Cokesbury Press, Nashville. \$1.50)

A REVIEW AND AN APPRECIATION, BY KENNETH CORNWELL

WILLIAM JAMES! Begbie! and now Stidger!

I traveled 2,000 miles to spend nine months in the classes of this author at the Boston University School of Theology. Thank God for those months! I can never be the same dead self nor can you if you read this book for it will mean that for you:

Spring is come and winter fled,
Christ is risen from the dead.

That's what happens to the soul that claims the Great Redemption.

This book was written under definite conviction—the conviction being that the church has but one excuse for existing, the minister no apology to give if men and women are being led constantly and definitely to a saving knowledge of Christ Jesus, Our Lord. I can prove this!

I sat talking with this author at his own dinner table in Newtonville, Massachusetts, a few days ago. I was up to my old tricks, namely, pumping great preachers to get them to tell me their cardinal ideas for success, and how to win men for Christ. This man said to me:

If I did not believe in conversion and a definite change of life I would quit preaching immediately.

And yet again:

I don't care what these theologians say; there must be a feeling of utter futility; and then a feeling of joy as God comes in.

And again:

A definite sudden experience is necessary to every minister. If you don't have it you lose nine-tenths of your power. I mean an experience apart from religious growing.

Dr. Stidger is one of Methodism's mighty men who is not ready to barter soul-passion for red tassels and pots of burning incense. Leaning across that table toward me with a look on his face that caused Mrs. Stidger to interject a "Now, Daddy," he snapped,

Methodism is built around preaching and evangelism. We're always apologizing for our emotion—the Lord God knows we need to break down in tears sometimes.

I do not have space to quote from this book. Suffice it to say that the preface to it is an entire refutation of those little critics who use the names "Stidger" and "Methods" as synonyms and to those constantly fearful lest young men in Boston will only become "little Stidgers."

So here is a book to make your soul stand up and sing. This book will do three things for you:

(1) It will shake your soul wide-awake to the power and possibility of Christ to revolutionize human lives. The old Moody-emphasis on individual salvation is coming back. The two most touching stories of conversion for me were those of Fred Stone and Peter Switzer. I wanted to read this last story without interruption but I had to walk around the room and calm my emotions before sitting down again to finish it. And then in that account of the author's own conversion, what reader will not feel like jumping over the altar with Dr. Stidger as in his heart he says, "Lord Jesus enter Thou in?"

These quotes from page 147 sum up the author's viewpoint:

The religion of the future will be a getting back to fundamentals, the fundamentals of the past. We, like Prodigal sons, are coming home again to discover that religion is a personal knowledge of God through experience. The Church seems to have discarded the idea. The Church is dying as a result of that loss.

Dr. Stidger advances the idea that modern man needs a modern technique of finding God—that technique being solitude, quietness, aloneness, the desert. Having found God, then to come back to tell the old, ever new story of "Jesus and his Love."

(2) It will bring you heart blasting and life-interest accounts of that which relates to the very foundation of your preaching. Tell the stories of these converted men and see your patient congregations react as if under the treatment of blood-transfusions.

(3) Incidentally it will teach you why and how the real Stidger makes friends. He is rich in friends—from every walk of life, in every country on every continent. Most preachers would have passed Dr. Potter up

as not worth the orthodox consideration but our author gets hold of the worthwhile and uses it for his own purpose.

In the last chapter of the book is a scientific study and statement of the Great Redemption Approach and Process. This chapter alone is worth the price of the book. In a crushing climax it focuses the entire thought and aim of the book.

I received a blessing from reading this book. I covet for you the same joy.

Reviews of Recent Books

Holy Week: Sermons on the Passion of our Lord. By Rev. Henderson N. Miller, Ph.D. The Pridecrafters, Pubs., Lansdale, Pa., or The United Lutheran Publication House, 1228 Spruce Street, Philadelphia, Pa. Price, 35c.

Do you want Holy Week to be indeed a *holy* week in your experience? Then get this volume of brief, pointed and deeply spiritual sermons on the events of the last week of our Lord's earthly life. These events are arranged in their proper chronological order, so that the reader can follow Jesus day by day from Palm Sunday to Good Friday, culminating in His vicarious death upon the cross. The book is not only useful in refining and strengthening the believer's love for Jesus Christ; it is also a corrective of the wrong ideas of many people today that they may be saved by their own merits and good character. In his preface the author says: "Lent is profitable to maintain the truth of the Christian religion, that is, salvation by faith in Jesus Christ who suffered on the cross for the sins of the world—rather than salvation by human character." He also adds: "There can be no better discipline in the Christian life, no greater incentive to faith and work, than to meditate upon the significant and sorrowful events in this important period in the life of the Christ." To this purpose this attractive booklet is devoted.

The Bible of the Expositor and the Evangelist, Vol. XIII. By William B. Riley, D.D. Union Gospel Press, Cleveland, Ohio; also L. W. Camp, 1020 Harmon Place, Minneapolis, Minn. Price, \$1.00; postage, 15 cents.

You may always be sure of spiritual verve and uplift when you hear Dr. Riley speak or read what he writes. He is never tame in the pulpit or on the printed page. His intense conviction imparts itself to the very words and lines which he uses. The present volume

is the thirteenth in this notable series on Biblical books, and contains Dr. Riley's comments on Philippians, Colossians and First and Second Thessalonians. In each case he gives an analysis of the book and enough other introductory data regarding it to set forth its primary purpose; then he takes up certain outstanding passages and gives expository and applicatory comments upon them. Such a volume will be of much value to all classes of Bible students, and will be especially suggestive to the minister for preaching purposes and to the Bible teacher for instructional uses.

The Bible of the Expositor and the Evangelist, Vol. XIV. By Rev. William B. Riley, D.D. Union Gospel Press, Cleveland, Ohio; also as above. Price, \$1.00; postage, 15 cents.

The commendatory words said of the preceding volume can in full justice be said of this one, which deals with First and Second Timothy. What rich treasures old and new are brought out in this volume! Paul said many fine things in his letters to Timothy, and we do not wonder that Dr. Riley catches both the atmosphere and fire of them. Just think of these live subjects in Dr. Riley's table of contents: "The Law of the Lawless," 1 Tim.1:8-17; "The Making of the Minister," 1 Tim.4:14-16; "Woman's Rights in Society," 1 Tim.5:6; "The Method of Bible Study," 2 Tim.2:15; "The Scientific Spirit in Scripture Study," 2 Tim.2:15-19; "Feminine Folly and Sin," 2 Tim.3:1-7. Don't you want to know what Dr. Riley, out of his deep studies and rich experience, has to say on these topics? Well, there is an easy way to find out. Just order this book.

Transactions of the Victoria Institute (1930).

Published by the Victoria Institute, 1 Central Building, Westminster, S.W.1, England.

Here in America we ought to be acquainted with the purpose and work of the Victoria Institute of Great Britain—otherwise known as the Philosophical Society of that country. The volume before us gives the sixty-second annual report of its accomplishments. It stands firmly for the historic Christian faith. Some of the most outstanding scholars of Great Britain are members of the organization and speak at its notable conventions. Before us lies the last volume issued by the society, and it surely contains a rich table of contents. Here are the leading articles which were presented in carefully prepared papers at the last annual convention, and then discussed by various members who were in attendance: *The Garden Tomb at Jerusalem*; *Christ and the Scriptures*; *Scientific Discoveries and the Noachian Deluge*; *Arabs and Jews in Palestine*; *The Date of Ecclesiasticus*; *The Significance of the Old Testament to Our Lord*; *The Apologies of Bacon, Butler and Paley* (how far are they profitable today?); *The Last Days of Our Lord's Ministry*; *The Concept of Evolution in the New Psychology*; *Joshua and the Higher Critics*; *The Jews Under the Palestinian Mandate*; *Creation and Modern Cosmogony*. The article on evolution is by Dr. H. C. Morton, whose book on *The Bankruptcy of Evolution* is known to our readers through our frequent references to it. The last article is by Sir Ambrose Fleming, D.Sc., F.R.S., the president of the Institute and a noted scientist. All people who are interested in the scholarly defense of the Holy Scriptures and vital Christianity ought to get this monumental volume.

The Mind of Christ in Paul. By Frank Chamberlin Porter, D.D. Charles Scribner's Sons, 597 Fifth Ave., New York. \$2.50.

Dr. Porter is Professor Emeritus of Biblical Theology in Yale Divinity School. In this book he gives us a profound discussion of Paul's relation to Christ. His style of expression is singularly elevated, and his thought is of the mystical order that is somewhat difficult to follow and analyze by people who think in more concrete and definite terms. He does not agree with those modernists who hold that Paul misinterpreted Christ and imposed upon the world another religion rather than the true Christian religion according to Christ Himself. The religion of

Paul is the religion of Christ. Paul had the real mind of Christ, and this he received by his experience of the real living Christ. "The greatness of Paul consists in his likeness to Christ." Dr. Porter cites many passages from Paul's writings to prove that his experience of Christ corresponds with the representations of Christ in the gospels. However, while the book is good so far (though the winding logic is somewhat hard to follow), we feel that the whole Christ of the gospels and the epistles is not presented in this volume. The sole emphasis is placed on Paul's likeness to Christ in his ethical disposition, his humility, unselfishness, his altruistic spirit. There is no doctrine of Christ. He does not seem to be presented as "the Lord of glory," as "the express image of the invisible God," as "God blessed for evermore." Indeed, our author seems to disparage any attempt at formulating a Christology. In reading the book we could not help wondering whether there was any real recognition of the deity of Christ, or of the eternal Son of God incarnate in human nature. "Christ in me" and "I in Christ" are very properly stressed; but Paul also says of our Lord, "He loved me and gave Himself for me." The atoning death of Christ is surely put much to the fore in Paul's theology. "He who knew no sin became sin for us that we might become the righteousness of God in Him;" "Christ hath redeemed us from the curse of the law, being made a curse for us." After reading this book, we still feel that we must raise the question, Who is Christ?—that is, according to our author. If he gives the Petrine reply, "Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God," we have not found where it is explicitly stated. Yet a book on "the mind of Christ in Paul" surely ought to include Peter's great confession and our Lord's approval of it as coming from the Father.

In order to show that we are not alone in our unwillingness to give Dr. Porter's book our full endorsement, we quote from a review of it in a recent number of the *Presbyterian*: "Here we are landed in that hopeless subjectivism which has reduced modern theological science to such a (sad) state. Furthermore, there is throughout the whole book a profound silence on what was the heart of Paul's Christ, namely, the atoning value of His death. The soteriological aspects of this great theme are absent from this discussion."

Nor do we believe that the pre-existence, Lordship and divine Sonship of Christ are adequately treated, while the great vital doctrine of satisfaction to divine justice is omitted.

The Mysterious Universe. By Sir James Jeans. The Macmillan Company, 60 Fifth Ave., New York. Price, \$2.00.

If you want to be led "into the depths" and, to a large extent, left there, you will want to read this profound scientific treatise. So far as physical science goes, whether it examines the universe as a whole, or tries to analyze matter, motion, time or space, it lands you in mystery. There are guesses innumerable, but little, if any, certainty when science tries to pry into the ultimate essence and purpose of things. Even the problem as to whether the universe is friendly or hostile to life is uncertain. However, for the theist and Christian there are in this volume a few crumbs of comfort—although afterward even that little seems to turn into nebulosity. We would like to quote some helpful and suggestive sentences from the book, but the copyright page forbids reproduction in any form without permission in writing from the publishers, and we do not have the time to get such permission. We believe it would be helpful to the sale of books if publishers would permit quotations to be made freely. On page 158 Sir James expresses the view that there is evidence of Mind in the texture and process of the universe and that there is a large measure of agreement on that view among the outstanding scientists of our times. It is a virtual admission on the part of scientists that they cannot adequately explain the cosmos without positing back of it and in it a personal Creator and Preserver. However, his closing paragraphs seem to cast doubt on even this doctrine. So "The Mysterious Universe" is still a mystery, whose origin, purpose and destiny are unknown to the puzzled scientists. However, the Christian, who has had "the love of God shed abroad in his heart by the Holy Spirit," knows by experience what the scientist cannot by searching find out, namely, that a just and all-wise God is the Creator, Preserver, yes, and the Redeemer of the world.

You know the value of prayer: it is precious beyond all price. Never, never neglect it.—
Sir Thomas Buxton.

Additional Literary Notes

We are glad that others have seen the merit in Frank E. Gaebelein's book, *Exploring the Bible*, which was reviewed in *The Bible Champion* for December, 1929, and which is published by Harper & Brothers, 49 East 33rd Street, New York. Price, \$1.50. In a recent issue of the *Sunday School Times* the editor says: "I had a remarkable experience in reading that book, and in writing as I did about it. Rarely could I write any such enthusiastic and unrestrained commendation of a book; but I could not help writing just what I did in this case."

A correspondent of the *Times* has this to say about Dr. Gaebelein's book: "Now I am going through it a second time with my pencil and notebook. It 'sho' is good. I am glad you commended it so highly, and am grateful to God for the man who wrote it."

Dr. Gaebelein's excellent book is well adapted to counteract the negative influence of such liberalistic books as Trattner's *Unravelling the Book of Books* and the output of Sanders, Peritz and Bade.

The following interesting items come from the American Tract Society, whose headquarters are at 7 West 45th Street, New York City:

A new Spanish hymnal called "El Himnario" has just been published by the American Tract Society in music and word editions. The hymnal has six hundred pages and is equal in style and workmanship to the best English hymnals published. It was largely edited by Mr. Wm. B. Boomer, the veteran missionary of Chile, who passed, to his reward a few months ago. He spent a lifetime in its preparation and had the cooperation of missionaries of all denominations.

The American Tract Society has published Spanish hymnals for many years, but this is the largest enterprise of its kind ever undertaken by any publisher. The Society is gradually giving foreign groups hymnals which in every way compare with the finest English hymnals.

The new Spanish hymnal was used for the first time on Sunday, February 22, at the opening of the new house of worship for the Spanish Evangelical Church at 142 West 115th St. of which Dr. Juan Orts Gonzalos is pastor.

Our Serial—The Clamping of the Shackles

A story that deals effectively with some of the crucial questions that are now disrupting the Church of our Lord Jesus Christ

PROFESSOR GLENN GATES COLE, LITT.D.

BRIEF SYNOPSIS OF PREVIOUS CHAPTERS

After dividing his congregation on critical questions, Peyton Harker, a brilliant preacher with little real Christianity, has been given a leave of absence for two years. His investigations during this time, reinforced by the influences of Wanda Reese, have produced a change of views and he is now engaged in itinerating when he crosses the path of Otie Nelson.

Otie, a girl of his former congregation at Warburton, perverted by his worldly preaching, had eloped with Guy Mason, one of his deacons, also a victim of his theories. Mason had abandoned his wife, Stella, and little daughter Fairy. Otie tells her story and Harker begins to realize his guilt and dangerous influences.

Wanda Reese, ruined by the same teachings as had perverted Harker at the university, converted and reformed, had half-promised to marry Harker and they were looking forward to the culmination of this plan. She had suspicioned the danger to Otie and Mason, had gone to Pittsburgh to intercept them when she was mysteriously struck down and hovered for a long time between life and death.

Another victim of the dangerous theories of Harker, is John Lewis. He is out on bail charged with forgery. He and his companion Dan Wise, and Mrs. Donald a former sweetheart of Harker, were all under suspicion in the mysterious attack on Wanda, when Otie dissipates the mystery by implicating Guy as the assailant. Lewis is on the road to reformation assisted by the influences of a splendid young friend of his, Mary Austin. At this juncture, Jennie Wise, a dissolute friend of his underworld past has come forward to Warburton, is quartered at the hotel and has sent him a note commanding him to call.

WHEN John Lewis received his summons to appear before Jennie Wise at the hotel, his heart sank. To go to her would be tantamount to turning his back upon the better life he was coming into, to forsake the incomparable Mary Austin, and go out into the life that Jennie represented and the entanglement of crime and perhaps prison. For he had learned that sooner or later one always had to face the result of crime, and the world was not large enough to hide from broken law. Jennie meant an association with her criminal brother Dan, and the contaminating influences of Jennie's companions. Even if Dan never returned, Jennie would sink him into ignominy.

For two hours, he fought his lone battle on the great plain of his soul. His thoughts rallied to the charge, only to go down before the countercharge. Had he but known it, the same old devil and Michael were fighting for his soul just as they did for the possession of Moses. It was the age-old contest in the human heart: should good or evil triumph?

But the expected result came. There could

XXIX

Jennie Threatens Mary

Sooner or later, one always has to face the results of his crime. The world is not large enough for one to hide from broken law.

be but one decision to such an issue. He went to Jennie, but he went in the spirit of temporizing and not open subjection.

There is no need to recount the conversation nor the arguments that Jennie brought forth. It is needless to record the words with

which he sought to temporize with her. When he left her, he realized that he was beaten, but he would resist acquiescence to the very last! Who knows what unexpected reinforcements might not arrive if he could defer final action?

Reinforcements?! But where were these likely to arise? Jennie gave him until the next morning to join her in her return to Columbus. She had accused him of having another sweetheart in Warburton, and he had not denied it. How could he deny the truth? She had threatened to go personally to Mary Austin and expose him to her; and John knew she would make good her threat. He might as well give up, for otherwise he could not protect Mary from such a contaminating situation. Still, every fibre of his loyal heart throbbed in rebellion against desert-

ing the beautiful and winsome Mary, and the clean, upward-tending life that he planned to enjoy with her.

Reinforcements? A happy thought came to him. Who was it that had always said the words that meant the most in every critical stage of his career thus far? Who was it that counseled as mother and sister had never been able to do? Who but Wanda Reese? With a new hope he set out to find her. If there were any device to deliver him from his fate, she would be able to suggest it. As he went, he prayed fervently that the Great Power of the Supreme God might show Wanda a means for his escape.

But Wanda's plan, seemed an ineffectual one, when, finally understanding the gravity of the situation, she volunteered to see Jennie herself. John could not believe that even as resourceful and reliant as Wanda was, she could cope with the intriguing, unprincipled Jennie Wise. But in lieu of anything more satisfactory, he left her, somewhat reassured by her promise to see Jennie that very night. Perhaps he would know his fate before he slept!

But Wanda was doomed to disappointment. Jennie had disappeared from the hotel shortly after dark, and no one could assure her when she would return. There was nothing to do, but await her return.

As soon as John Lewis had left her, Jennie stood a moment in thought, then stamped her foot angrily. Over her painted face crept a hard look, unpleasant to see. To one who knew her it presaged a coming storm. Then, she threw herself into a chair, threw one knee carelessly over the chair-arm, and as she swung her foot, set herself to plot.

We do not know what she thought, nor what she planned, nor what hopes or despair swept her. At times she glowered in black anger, and anon she smiled. An hour passed, and then another. She forgot her hunger in her dark fancies. Finally night came down, creeping so stealthily that she did not realize how dark it was until she felt the impact of light from bulbs here and there being turned on outside her room. She sat in darkness save where the sword-like blade of silver from a street lamp penetrated the room to stab the dimness to its heart.

Then she arose, and went out. She had surreptitiously pried into all of John's affairs earlier in the day through a gossiping chambermaid, who apparently knew much of his

doings. Hence there was no hesitation nor indecision in her movements. She knew what she wanted to do, and where she wanted to go. So straight as a homing pigeon flies, she went to the home of Mary Austin.

Stealthily, she hid behind the dark embowered shrubbery in the yard, working her way carefully and unobserved towards the veranda and window opening upon it, through which fell the bright light from within. The window shades had not been lowered, and she had a full view of the interior. There was no one in the room.

Stationing herself in the shadow, but where she could survey much of the interior she waited. A half hour passed; and the strain was wearing her patience, when there was a soft rustle within, and Mary Austin entered. Jennie crouched in eager attention. Instinctively, she knew who it was. Mary went at once to the piano, quite oblivious of her watcher, seated herself upon the bench, and in apparent idle meditation let her hands wander purposely over the keys. But Mary had a decided musical talent, and the purposeless, almost outthought wanderings of her hands produced a semblance of harmony. She was hardly conscious of it. Her mind was far in maiden fancies.

For an instant, something like an admiring glance lighted the face of the watching girl. And this was her rival! This was her enemy. She realized with a pang of pain that the intelligent, attractive, cultured girl before her, was one that no sensible man like John would surrender, especially for one like herself. Her heart momentarily failed her. She loved John Lewis; why should such a creature stand between him and her own happiness? A gleam of hate came into her eyes. What was this creature that dared cross the path to her heart's ambitions? She was accustomed to strike out in her own interests. She *would* have John—no one in the world should be permitted to take him away from her! She ground her teeth and clenched her hands in rage. Insane, jealous passion gripped her. She would kill her rival! It was the instinct of her class to take by force if necessary. Whether it was the theft of money, of property, or of love, it was all the same process. She would tear those chestnut locks from the girl's head! she would scratch into scarred welts that beautiful face! she would maim; she would kill! If she only had a weapon—why had she not brought one? Well,

no matter; she was strong and sinewy! with her own bare hands she would strangle the doll-faced creature that dared to separate her from her lover! she threw herself in a frenzy against the window, and it crashed in. Her hands were bleeding from a score of cuts. Blood! The sight of her dripping hands brought a faintness. Feebly, with a sound of roaring in her ears, she toppled forward and fell through the open window to add her dishevelled, bruised form to the wreck within!

At the unexpected crash, Mary turned in screaming affright from the piano, and stood frozen with horror at the sight before her. At her alarming scream her mother hastened in, and stood like the daughter transfixed with the unexpected view. But she quickly recovered her balance and flew to the assistance of the prostrate insensible girl. In an instant, she had drawn the girl's head to her knee, and had sent Mary hastening after bandages and restoratives. Hardly speaking, the two set to work to clear away the slivers of shattered glass from the girl's face, arms, and hands, bandage the wounds, and restore her to consciousness.

With tender care, they bore her to a couch, and when Jennie came slowly back to consciousness, she found their kindly faces bent over her in solicitous concern. She revolted inwardly at the unexpected weakness that had robbed her of her revenge at the very moment of victory. She pretended not to be conscious. With closed eyes and motionless form, she plotted and planned only to realize that she was defeated. But as she surreptitiously appraised her captors, the cunning of her depraved nature suggested another course. The kindly sympathetic faces above her suggested what she unspeakingly designated, "soft!"

They were aware now that she was conscious. "Who are you, my dear girl?" Mrs. Austin inquired. "And how did you get here in this unnatural fashion? And how did you hurt yourself?"

Thus chided, Jennie for the first time realized the bandaged condition of her hands, and that the tingling painful spots on her face were patches of courtplaster. With vindictive stubbornness, she sat up, and glowered at her captors. There was naught but sympathetic commiseration on the faces of the two. It was time to begin her planned battle of wits. She turned to Mrs. Austin.

"I am John Lewis' fiancée," she declared, truculently. There was a suppressed scream from Mary. The girl turned to her.

"It is the truth!" she said, explosively. "I have no ring, but it is true. I know who you are, and that you with your baby beauty of a face are trying to win him away from me! But I shall never give him up! He is mine!"

Mary recoiled from her, as from a serpent about to strike, but deigned no reply to the furious words. She was stunned by the unexpected disclosure and the evident implication of the girl. This painted, crime-marked creature, John Lewis' fiancée? It was unthinkable; but yet—

Receiving no reply to her revelation, but sensing a spirit of doubt, she continued:

"He was mine before he ever made love to you! How dared he do it? I'll kill him before I'll ever give him up to you!"

Mary's pride was touched. How dared this disreputable creature to speak thus to her? Her anger flamed up. She broke out with:

"Calm yourself, girl! If John Lewis is your fiancée, no decent girl will want to take him away from you!" And having made this angry reply, Mary walked proudly from the room.

"Now, I want to know your name," said Mrs. Austin, with authority.

"My name is Jennie Wise. You may ask John if what I say is true," she insisted.

"Where do you live?" was Mrs. Austin's next question.

"In Columbus," she replied honestly. "You know John was there a long time."

"And you are engaged to him?" persisted Mrs. Austin.

"Ask him if you disbelieve me!" the girl replied angrily.

"Now, tell me how you came to be here tonight, and why you broke in our window," Mrs. Austin relentlessly continued.

Realizing that she was apprehended in wrong-doing, the girl's arrogant bravado disappeared.

"Really, Mrs. Austin," the girl replied, apologetically. "I did not think what I was doing. I am sorry I broke the window."

"But why did you do it?" the woman persisted.

"I wanted to get at Mary," the girl explained, honestly. "I wanted to choke her! I wanted to have revenge on her for taking my lover away from me!"

"I suppose you realize you have committed a punishable crime in breaking in the window as you have?"

Jennie was too familiar with all forms of crime and vice to have any illusions as to the enormity of her offense.

"Yes; I suppose I am liable to arrest," she said.

Mrs. Austin left it at that, and shifted her question.

"Has Mr. Lewis broken his engagement to you?" she asked.

"He has tried to," she confessed.

"And you have refused to release him?" the woman insisted.

"Of course. I am not going to give John up!" she remonstrated.

"Why does he want to break with you?"

"He thinks I am not good enough for him. He wants Mary!" the girl explained.

"Did he say so?"

"No," admitted the girl, honestly. "But I have found out all about it."

"I think you and Mr. Lewis ought to settle all this in your own way. You had no business coming here—and in the way you did. I am going to phone for the police, and turn you over to them. I am not going to have such scandalous actions in my house."

The girl dropped on the floor before the woman. All her bravado was gone again. She was but a poor, cringing creature, begging for mercy now.

"Please, Mrs. Austin, let me go. I was wild with jealousy. I did not know what I was doing. Please pity me!"

Mrs. Austin appeared to reflect. She did not want to create any scandalous talk about the matter; but she must prevent any spiteful revenge upon her daughter.

"You promise to leave Mary alone?" she asked.

"Yes; I promise! Oh, please let me go!" the girl supplicated.

"I will think about it; perhaps I ought to let you, but I am not sure. Get up, and take that chair over there."

The girl did as directed. She saw she had lost any advantage here. Her only appeal now was to John. Suppose he, too, spurned and rejected her; what then? She set her jaw. She would not give up, yet. But she must be careful and control herself. In a more moderate tone, she asked:

"Can I talk to Mary? Please, Mrs. Austin,

let me appeal to her. Honestly, I must tell her something. She ought to know."

Mrs. Austin did not see why this request should be granted. Then, a light broke upon her. Perhaps in the doubt, it might be a proper thing, after all. She was not quite satisfied at Mary's firm friendship for John Lewis. In fact, she hoped that something might occur to cause him to cease his attentions to Mary. She had never been overly enthusiastic at Mary's preference for the young man. Now, she realized that any incrimination that Jennie might lay upon John would repel Mary. Perhaps the way was open to break up the infatuation of her daughter for this objectionable suitor! She would try it.

Fate, and not Wanda was solving the intricate problem of John Lewis that night. But would fate be as kind as the girl who had set herself to the complete reformation of this unfortunate victim of Peyton Har-ker's misguided advice?

Thy Word is Truth

Thy Word is truth. Again we sing
This wondrous fact. Loud may it ring.
And may each page be clear and bright,
Illumined by the Spirit's light.

Thy Word is truth. Oh, grant us grace
On every page Thy love to trace,
Help us anew the theme begin
Of how that love redeems from sin.

Thy Word is truth. Its quick'ning light
Dispels the gloom of sin's dark night,
It cheers the faint upon the road,
And safely guides to Thine abode.

Thy Word is truth. It standeth fast
While sun, and moon and stars shall last.
While heaven and earth have passed away,
Thy Word shall still remain its sway.

Thy Word is truth. We'll hold it so,
Through all our days, in weal or woe.

Thy Word is truth. It sets us free.
We'll chant it through eternity.

I see that righteousness and love are useful and beautiful here—they will be beautiful and useful anywhere; and the clearer the light in which they are brought to stand, the more their glory will be revealed. I see that sin and selfishness are mean and hateful here—they will be mean and hateful anywhere; and the clearer the light in which they stand, the more their hatefulness will be manifest.—*Charles Reynolds Brown.*